

Security

tions, some of which were discovered by ourselves and brought to light by ourselves, we set in place the proper machinery to get to the bottom of them and to get the answers.

If we pass this motion, we would apparently have going on, and relating to the same incidents, a royal commission inquiry under Mr. Justice McDonald, a police investigation in the province of Quebec, a royal commission taking place in the province of Quebec, and a House of Commons special committee with apparently the same powers. This whole situation is serious, as are some of the allegations and suggestions that have been made. They have caused all of us grave concern and they are now causing grave concern all across this country, including grave concern on the part of the commissioner, officers and the men of the RCMP.

Surely, the proper way to get to the bottom of these allegations and suggestions is through the instrumentality of an impartial, non-partisan forum in the form of a royal commission. That is what we have provided, and that is what is going on. We, as a government, will co-operate—contrary to the suggestions of the Leader of the Opposition—to the fullest possible extent with the royal commission. That has been said by the Prime Minister and other ministers in the House, and for the hon. member to suggest in his speech today to the contrary simply reinforces my thesis that today's debate and this resolution are nothing more than a crass, transparent device to manipulate public opinion.

● (1732)

I would suggest if members of the opposition have the regard and respect for the officers and men of the RCMP which they profess, it seems to me in a system of law, wherein the rule of law provides that the most heinous of criminals is entitled to a fair and impartial hearing, that surely members of the RCMP and of the security service, who have served this country well, are entitled to a fair, full, impartial, and non-partisan hearing in the form of a royal commission. Mr. Speaker, that is what we have provided.

Instead, we have the suggestion that we should now have a standing committee or a special committee of the House of Commons headed by a member of the opposition, possibly the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek). He made an address in this House not too long ago. At the present time any such committee in this House could in no way provide a fair and impartial hearing on the very serious matters which are at stake here.

Apparently the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley has not been disowned by his leader, even though he referred to Harvard University as being a spawning ground of leftist intellectuals, and that apparently the University of Montreal has become a pro Castro stronghold.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) is not quoting directly from the comments of the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek). He is quoting from what the hon.

[Mr. Basford.]

member for High Park-Humber Valley read into the record, which was authored by someone else other than himself.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the hon. member has raised that point of order. That was precisely what I was doing. I can only take it that the interest of the hon. member opposite, and of some of his colleagues, is to introduce into the record of this House things that are utter nonsense.

Mr. Jarvis: Get serious.

Mr. Basford: Actually I am looking for a word which is parliamentary to describe their interest. That indicates the tactics which would occur in a special committee. They would introduce into the record all sorts of utter nonsense, and when they are challenged on it, they try to disown it, and run away from it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: For a number of weeks last May and June hon. members opposite called for a royal commission of inquiry into all that was going on. That commission has been established by the government at the request of the Commissioner of the RCMP. It has backfired on hon. members opposite. Now they are trying to find a device to get out of the political hole they have dug for themselves.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: We on this side of the House do not intend to assist them, and obviously we intend to vote against this motion, which is a crass, transparent attempt to manipulate public opinion.

The real reason came to light from the speech of the right hon. member for Prince Albert when he started talking about an election campaign. It is obvious hon. members opposite want to get this committee going before an election, want to have some hearings, and want to fill those hearings with various partisan, political innuendoes. They want it set up so that it would be in full operation before the next election. That is their object. They are not interested in ministerial responsibility. They are not interested in the civilian control of security forces, which is a matter that is being examined by the royal commission. By means of this committee in the very short term, they are trying to get their house in order for the next election. That is their object, and we will not participate in that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) that the allotted time of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has expired.

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, in following the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) in this