

Security

Canada has not criticized these strategies. The Atlantic Provinces Economic Council supports these strategies.

● (1827)

The philosophy and policies of development for the Atlantic region were formulated with the governments of the Atlantic provinces in 1974 at the beginning of the world turn-down. These policies, however, which range over the more productive and efficient use of resources, the enhancement of more value added and industrial development in the region, necessary infrastructure for economic development, and the reinforcement of urban centres of strength, remain valid and will pay off. At the present time over 35 action pacts under these strategies are under way across the region and will produce measurable results in the coming years. I know that the Atlantic provincial governments support DREE. I am firmly convinced that the people of the region also support and understand what DREE is doing in Atlantic Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been withdrawn. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

Motion withdrawn.

At 6.28 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTED DAY S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—ALLEGED FAILURE OF MINISTERS TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR METHODS USED BY SECURITY FORCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Clark:

That this House has no confidence in the competence or desire of this government to follow the principle of ministerial responsibility, particularly as it applies to the direction of and methods used by the government security forces, and deeply regrets its unwillingness to allow a committee of this House to study the role of ministers in security operations.

● (2002)

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if we are to judge by the mealy-mouthed and monotonous comments of the previous speaker, the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), whose full and specific meaning eluded us because he read a little too fast an overly lengthy text, which is in contrast with his enthusiasm of the last two weeks in this matter, there is no doubt now, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition has been called to

[Mr. Maine.]

order by an alert public opinion fully aware of the priceless value of the RCMP. It is now beating a retreat and avoiding any disparaging comment against an organization which after all deserves the respect and admiration of all Canadians.

Faced with the double standard of behaviour suggested by the opposition, namely our unwarranted intervention for which we are blamed in the inquiry about the Sky Shops affair or the lack of it in the case involved in this debate, it is important, Mr. Speaker, to point out among significant facts one that deserves attention and seems to be deliberately overlooked by the opposition, that is the creation by the government on last July 6 of a royal commission of inquiry, the McDonald Commission. Therefore, it is important to review the facts in the true context of an institution democratically and legally constituted to shed light on the whole matter. So, on July 6, 1977, the government acknowledged several facts, and I quote, ... the government acknowledges the fact that it has been established that certain persons who were members of the RCMP at the time did, on or about October 7, 1972, take part jointly with persons who were then members of la Sûreté du Québec and la Police de Montréal in the entry of premises located at 3459 St. Hubert Street, Montreal, in the search of those premises for property contained therein, and in the removal of documents from those premises, without lawful authority to do so;

The government acknowledges the fact that allegations have recently been made that certain persons who were members of the RCMP at the time may have been involved on other occasions in investigative actions or other activities that were not authorized or provided for by law;

The government acknowledges the fact that, after having made inquiries into these allegations at the instance of the government, the Commissioner of the RCMP now advises that there are indications that certain persons who were members of the RCMP may indeed have been involved in investigative actions or other activities that were not authorized or provided for by law; and that as a consequence, the commissioner believes that in the circumstances it would be in the best interests of the RCMP that a commission of inquiry be set up to look into the operations and policies of the security service on a national basis;

● (2012)

The government recognized, on July 6, 1977, and I quote:

Since public support of the RCMP in the discharge of its responsibility to protect the security of Canada is dependent on trust in the policies and procedures governing its activities;

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1977, the government acknowledged the following:

AND WHEREAS the maintenance of that trust requires that full inquiry be made into the extent and prevalence of investigative practices or other activities involving members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that are not authorized or provided for by law.

THEREFORE, the Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, advise that—be Commissioners under Part I of the Inquiries Act.

Members of the opposition who have been complaining that the commission of inquiry does not have the necessary powers to investigate all details of the incidents referred to these last few weeks should read sections 4 and 5, Part I of the Inquiries Act. Section 4 clearly stipulates the following:

The commissioners have the power of summoning before them any witnesses—

Including ministers.

—and of requiring them to give evidence on oath, or on solemn affirmation if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters, and orally or in writing, and