

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General is worried about the word. He knows more about this incident than the House of Commons does.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** He told us today that it was the director general who was involved in discussions and who authorized—he will interrupt me if I am incorrect—whatever action led the security services to be in possession of membership lists and financial information regarding the Parti Québécois. He said today that the authority rested with the director general. The question for the House of Commons and for the minister is: who gave the director general that authority? To whom does he report? With whom did he have the responsibility to clear that action? Where was the Solicitor General? Who is the responsible minister in this House?

Throughout all this, Mr. Speaker, the government has not been particularly forthcoming with information which the House of Commons and the country requires so that we can know exactly what went on in this case. Indeed, there have been attempts as recently as the question period this afternoon to try dramatically to put down questions from this side of the House so as little as possible would be known about these events.

There are a number of specific questions which I want to put on the record tonight in the hope that the Solicitor General and others who might speak will address their minds to them. But there is one other matter which relates to the possibility of having a full inquiry into the question of the responsibility of ministers of the Crown for the activities of the security apparatus of the Government of Canada and the authority on which security forces in this country are acting. We would prefer to have a special committee of this parliament struck with the full powers to carry out the investigation, to gather the evidence, to subpoena the witnesses, which would result in a clear picture being painted for all the people of Canada as to what exactly is going on here. That is what we would prefer.

The minister instead says that we have this already. We have it in the McDonald royal commission. If that is to be the minister's response he knows that we at least, and many others in this country, have very serious reservations as to whether or not the terms of reference of the McDonald inquiry are broad enough to allow that inquiry to look at the central question, which is: what was the role of the minister in all of these affairs? What is the responsibility of the cabinet in all this business?

I suggested in July of this year that if the minister wanted to continue to hide behind the royal commission the least he could do would be to write into the terms of reference of that royal commission a provision which would make it absolutely clear that it had the responsibility to report upon the role of ministers of the Crown. Once again I should like to suggest to the minister, if he intends to continue to hide behind the royal commission, that he add to the terms of reference of that commission another term of reference, which I would be pleased to read, namely:

#### RCMP

To investigate and report on the manner in which Solicitors General and the Prime Minister have exercised their constitutional obligation to supervise fully the activities of the security service of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and report thereon to the Parliament of Canada.

I would hope that this debate tonight will begin the procedure of spelling out the relation between the security officers of the Government of Canada and the ministers of the government, and will begin to ensure that we can have some accountability to the House of Commons, through ministers, for the activities of the security services.

● (2022)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** I know my time is running out in this debate—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** —but I should like to add for the record a number of questions which I hope the Solicitor General will answer tonight when he enters this debate.

First, we want to know whether there are other incidents of illegal activity by federal security forces of which the Solicitor General now has knowledge. If so, we want the minister to tell the House what they are, when they happened, and specifically, under whose authority they were carried out.

Second, we note that the Prime Minister said that in 1973 or 1974—he is not sure—he ordered the security forces to stop systematic surveillance of the Parti Québécois. We want to know what information the Prime Minister had at that time about the existing surveillance of the Parti Québécois, and in what form did he order it stopped. Was it done in writing? If so, to whom, and with what provisions for enforcement?

By its own version of events, the government—at least the then solicitor general and the Prime Minister—learned in March of 1976 of the illegal break-in at the APLQ office. We want to know what specific steps they initiated at that time to ensure that this was, in fact, as they claim, “an exceptional and isolated” incident. Why, again by the minister's version, did it take until September of 1977 for information on three further incidents of illegal activity to come to the attention of the government?

According to the minister, it has been standard practice for some time for the Solicitor General of Canada to meet on a weekly basis with the director general of security services. In all frankness, I have to ask the minister the following: is it the contention of the government that the question of illegal activities by security services was not raised during those meetings? Those meetings would have numbered well over 100 during this period. Is the Solicitor General trying to tell us that he did not raise questions with the director general about these matters? Is he telling us that he raised those questions and received false information? We want to know what went on in those meetings. We want to know the state of knowledge of the minister or his predecessors.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!