

### Security

consistent with community standards of efficiency, justice, and decency. That is ministerial competence.

I am very reluctant to refer to that definition because it contains the word "operational", and I say this as an aside. Today as he stood in his place the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) went on at great length using that word and discussing the difficulty with his department interfering with the day-to-day operations of any security force. I agree, but he went on at such great length that I am now very concerned. We put questions earlier this week and last week with respect to whether the police security planning and analysis branch within his department was operational, and I am very nervous about the answers we now have because, according to the minister's definition, operational goes far beyond what I would have thought would have been the meaning of that word in the ordinary sense, and I believe we should ask those questions again. However, this third function is the test of a responsible minister in the sense of ministerial competence, and this House—not a royal commission, not an administrative tribunal, and not our law courts—will judge that competence.

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

**Mr. Jarvis:** If we are to judge the responsibility and the competence of a government or the ministers within that government we must do so, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, in the context of the times, but I would put that context much more honestly than the right hon. gentleman did. He was talking about 1972 and 1973, and the real context, as has been pointed out in this House, at that time was not murders and kidnapping. It was a minority Liberal government here in Ottawa and a Liberal government in Quebec getting ready for an election. It was a spill-over from Watergate. However, let us put this in the proper context of the times.

Let us go back to June of 1969 when the Prime Minister tabled the edited version of the Mackenzie royal commission report and rejected the recommendation of that commission, rightly or wrongly, for a security service separate from the RCMP. As reported at page 10637 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister said:

The security service, under the Commissioner of the RCMP, will be increasingly separate in structure and civilian in nature.

The Prime Minister said the security service would be under the Commissioner of the RCMP, but subsequent events give very serious doubts indeed as to whether it was under direct supervision of the Commissioner of the RCMP. However, leaving that aside, the important aspects in that statement by the Prime Minister in tabling the report were that the security service would be separate in structure and civilian in nature. What should that mean to a competent, responsible minister? It should mean a possible lack of policy direction from the minister and that this group would have none of the discipline or tradition of the RCMP. Therefore the minister responsible for that group should be doubly diligent.

On that very same day the then leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), who I am sure takes

[Mr. Jarvis.]

no satisfaction whatsoever in his prophecy, had this to say, and I quote from page 10639 of *Hansard*:

I am sure that members of parliament accept the necessity that much of the security operation is conducted outside our purview. What would be cause for grave concern would be any thought that much of the operation is beyond the ken of the ministry or the Prime Minister; that there are not ministers, elective and responsible members of government, to whom the entire security operation is an open book, who have continuing access to everything that is going on in that area, and who give proper, responsible, political, civilian direction to the operation on a continuing basis. None of us would want to see a security operation in this country running under its own steam and answerable only to itself—a government, so to speak, within the government. The very decision as to what affects security and what does not, what must be secret and what public, is finally a matter of political decision and judgment. The effective supremacy of the civilian authority must never be compromised in this matter.

• (2112)

This was the clearest possible warning to be vigilant, to be competent, to be responsible. All of this in June 1969, yet two years and three months later the then solicitor general, now the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), in a statement on motions described the operations of a group in his department called the Security Planning and Research Group. Any pretense of research soon disappeared. This is now known as the Police and Security Planning and Analysis Branch, under Colonel Bourne.

In giving that statement the then solicitor general clearly adopted the principles enunciated by the hon. member for Halifax, then Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. He clearly adopted those principles, clearly acknowledged the need for vigilance, competence and responsibility in this area of security. Along the way there was created a security secretariat in the Privy Council, and also some group or other in the Prime Minister's office. There was as well a cabinet committee on security chaired by the Prime Minister.

All of these—the security and intelligence group, the Solicitor General's group, the Privy Council secretariat, and the Prime Minister's group, were not composed of lowly civil servants but rather, highly placed men and women with direct access to ministers and the Prime Minister. Despite all of this, or perhaps because of the web the government created for itself, there has been no vigilance, no competence, and no responsibility.

The government must stand convicted in this court of one of two crimes. First, if the cabinet or some of its members knew of the illegalities and irregularities, they are guilty; if they did not know, they are equally guilty. We have to give the ministers and the government the benefit of the doubt, which is very hard in light of the revelations. Even giving them the benefit of the doubt we must ask ourselves whether they were careful to remain ignorant. For example, the Solicitor General said in so many words, "I cannot go through six years of files." Mr. Speaker, his time would have been better spent going through six years of files than engaging in the figure skating we have seen during the question period. I might excuse him if I knew he had been going through those files.

The Prime Minister says that to ask repeated questions would invite the accusation of having undue political influence on law enforcement agencies. What nonsense that is, Mr.