

and civilized society is of a different order from the media interest in sensationalism.

We have encountered new threats to safety in recent years, such as the activities of the Japanese Red Army, one of whom was found in Toronto last year and was got out of the country without incident, thanks to the RCMP intelligence. Also there have been the activities of the Baader-Meinhof gang in Germany, and terrorist groups in the Middle East. We have seen a massacre in Germany at the time of their Olympic Games, and we have seen our Olympic Games in Montreal conducted in peace because of our security forces.

Recently we had to send diplomats back to their own countries because of unacceptable activities in Canada. That information came from the RCMP security forces. On each occasion when a consular or an embassy official is required to leave Canada, the media asked for reasons and full disclosure. I do not detect much general support for that position. The average citizen does not consider that security intelligence needs to be printed in every newspaper, as long as the threat to our internal safety has been removed, and most important, as long as people have the confidence that our security officers have acted reasonably and responsibly.

Canadians want information when it is useful and practical. They want to know in general that our police and security forces act in a way which is consonant with our moral values. That may mean, in order to restore confidence at this time, it may be desirable to have a broader publication of such things as cabinet directives. On October 28 the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox), when speaking in this House, summarized the cabinet directive of March 27, 1975, which defined the mandate of the security service of the RCMP, and that of May 27, 1976, which dealt with security screening of public servants.

Public perception of security requirements changes in response to changing times. The broad general powers of the 1959 act are clearly not specific enough to be acceptable in our times.

The Royal Commission on Security statement in 1969 that "A security service is unavoidably involved in activities which run counter to the spirit, if not the letter of the law, and in illegal or other activities which seem to infringe upon individual rights", stated a position which had support in 1969 but which concerns many people today. Granted that security work involves undercover work and the use of informants, but one must ask if that should include illegal or extra-legal activities.

In 1974 the Protection of Privacy Act included a new definition of "subversive activities". The cabinet directive of 1975-1976 further attempted to bring more precision to a field where security officers were operating to a large extent on the basis of personal judgment.

The Royal Commission of Inquiry under Mr. Justice McDonald has broad powers to inquire into the national security service. I look forward to seeing their recommendations, which will assist us in defining precisely the parameters of effective and acceptable security procedures.

### *Security*

● (2102)

Particularly I hope that the RCMP, who up to this point have been excluded from participation in media coverage, will have an input to the commission proceedings. If experienced people who have a well developed evaluative bent have recommendations to make, those recommendations would surely be a very important ingredient, an ingredient which has been missing from the current debate and which is an essential part of the dialogue if procedures are to be brought about which are sensible and effective and are to be seen as such by all Canadians.

**Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot):** Mr. Speaker, the issue in this court is clearly ministerial responsibility, and let no one doubt that we are in a court. However, in this court it is not the RCMP which is on trial. I believe the government realizes that, despite the red herrings, the gymnastics, the gyrations, the figure skating and the repetition time and again from government benches, "RCMP, RCMP, RCMP". We heard that 24 times yesterday. Despite that it is the government and its ministers who are on trial, as they are on trial every day in our system of government. So let us forget the red herrings, the figure skating, and the gymnastics.

What is ministerial responsibility? There are many textbooks. I had five, I think, sent over from the parliamentary library tonight. There are many scholastic papers and academic dissertations. There is no shortage of material describing ministerial responsibility, but one definition which is a common sense definition is simply that ministerial responsibility is synonymous with ministerial competence. An irresponsible minister is an incompetent minister. That is the issue. A minister who is incompetent and so judged in this court, the House of Commons, ought to be returned to the back benches or sent back to private life. It is as simple as that.

The second aspect of ministerial responsibility is, responsible to what and for what? The "responsible to" is easy. A minister is responsible in a collective sense to the cabinet but ultimately to the House of Commons. Responsible for what? In my view, there are three categories of responsibility. First, the administrative lapses or errors for which an official is to blame and which could not possibly have been within the range of knowledge of the minister: in this case the minister owes an assurance that corrections have been made to prevent a recurrence.

Second, policy errors leading to departmental problems for which the entire cabinet takes responsibility: this having happened they are perfectly entitled to say, "If you don't like it, you can defeat us at the next election". That is a second form of responsibility.

There is a third one which the government, for some reason, fails to acknowledge. It has tried to throw all the illegal and unusual activity into one or other of those first categories. The third one is administrative lapses or errors in operational policy which should have been within the range of knowledge of a reasonably intelligent and energetic minister who, in accepting office, accepted the responsibility of supervising the operating procedures of his department to ensure they were