

Security

Instead of doing that, Mr. Speaker, the government erected a wall of indifference in this House. I think "concealment" is not too strong a word. I say that is totally unnecessary. If the government had come forward in a straightforward manner and said, "Some things have gone wrong which we did not know about but now we are prepared to act", then I think this House and the public of Canada would have gladly accepted that. But that is not the way the government chose to act. Among all of the principal ministers concerned there has been evasion. There has been failure to face the facts which were clearly put before them.

I want particularly to refer to something which was reported just today which the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox), who, I remind the House, is one of the law officers of the Crown, said. He is reported as saying that the RCMP felt nothing was unusual or wrong in operations, and that is why they did not report anything. That is why they kept the matter concealed from the minister himself. Surely no more gratuitous insult has ever been paid to the RCMP.

Does the Solicitor General really believe that the RCMP are so lacking in moral understanding that they do not understand the meaning of theft, or breaking or entering, or arson, taping other people's telephone conversations, or tampering with their mail? Does he really think the RCMP do not know that is wrong? If he does think that, Mr. Speaker, then he is totally and utterly perverse. To imagine that the RCMP do not know better than that is, as I say, a gratuitous insult. That some of them erred is obvious. Their errors are serious and should be dealt with seriously; I am not arguing that. But to suggest that you can excuse them, as the Solicitor General tries to do by saying that they really did not know that they were breaking in, or that they were diverting the mail and that they did not know that it was wrong for them to do this, is ridiculous. Of course they knew it was wrong. Any child would know that breaking and entering or arson is wrong. Any child with half a brain would know that burning down barns is wrong.

I have been quoting the Solicitor General from an interview which he gave to the *Globe and Mail*, reported in its issue for November 15. The Solicitor General is a lawyer learned in the law—at least I presume he is—and in addition is one of the chief law officers of the Crown in this country. I say we have come to a pretty pass when a law officer comes up with a statement like that.

I should like to quote another statement made by the Solicitor General which appeared in the *Ottawa Today* newspaper for November 10. The headline reads: "Mounties Lied But Fox Defends Them Anyway". Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I ask what sort of Solicitor General do we have? If his employees are lying to him, why does he not take some action? Why does he defend them when they have lied to him? How can he expect any discipline or respect when he gets up in public and says that although the RCMP lied he is going to defend them in any event? I will not go into the text of the quotation but it can be found in *Ottawa Today* for Thursday, November 10.

The minister has constantly played down the seriousness of this matter. He has constantly taken a defensive view of some

[Mr. Brewin.]

matters which are clearly in no way defensible, least of all defensible by an employer who is responsible for maintaining law and order in Canada.

I now want to turn to the next scene in the act, and this concerns an even more distinguished individual. I refer to the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau). The Prime Minister has constantly played down this matter. According to another headline, the Prime Minister "was not prepared to condemn those in raid." He then went on to use one of the most crazy analogies I have ever heard. He said the situation was as if someone had an atom bomb and was about to blow up a city, so that you had to take immediate action. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! Did anybody in this whole story have any atom bombs ready to blow up anything at all? That analogy is utterly false. I cannot imagine what sort of reasoning would have allowed the Prime Minister to put those words into his mouth, yet that is what he said; I have the full text of his press conference.

The Prime Minister then went on to say something else which I found very remarkable. He said that the royal commission on security had said "Well, you know, you've got to stretch the law to its limits; sometimes it might even be stretched beyond its limits." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have looked through the report of the royal commission. I know personally two of the royal commissioners, one the late Mr. Coldwell who is not with us any more, and the other Mr. Max Mackenzie, and I cannot imagine either saying any such thing. Therefore I looked through the record to find out what they did say, and I can confirm they never said any such thing. This is not the Mackenzie doctrine or the security commission doctrine; that you stretch the law if you find it convenient to do so is the Trudeau doctrine. So much for the Prime Minister.

I do not want to forget, because he is my favourite *bête noire*, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). I hesitate to trust myself to describe the stand which he took. He went to Vancouver and spoke to a cheering crowd of people.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Liberals.

Mr. Brewin: Liberals. He lashed out at the opposition parties for pillorying the RCMP with innuendo and allegations. I say this is an absolute falsehood. We have not pilloried the RCMP. We have not used innuendo. We have not used mere allegation. We have used almost entirely the admissions made by the government itself, and by the Solicitor General on behalf of the government. Yet he lashes us for trying to do our duty in this House.

I hope that nothing will ever persuade me to listen to a Minister of Justice telling me that I should not dare attack something which I know is clearly wrong merely because someone is going to be critical about me for doing that. I think that members of the opposition have a clear duty to say what we did say on this matter, and I think we have done so honestly.