

Supply—Justice

detail did not add very much, except in volume of words, to the statement that was made by the Prime Minister.

In the latter part of his remarks he dealt with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which force comes particularly and peculiarly under his direction and control. May I say at once that I have known this force from its earliest days. I knew them on the prairies when they were the North-West Mounted Police. I knew them, as counsel, when they were the Royal Mounted Police. I have known them, of course, in the last years since 1920 when they took unto themselves their present name. It is a force great in its heritage, great in its achievements and great in the contributions that it has made to law and order in Canada. I am one who has a peculiar knowledge in that regard, for over the years I acted in the courts from day to day and had on the witness stand, generally on the other side except when I was prosecuting, members of that force. In the hundreds of cases in which I participated, only in one did I find on the part of any member of that force a departure from the elemental justice which has been characteristic of the force.

These criticisms to which the Minister of Justice has made reference are easily made. The force becomes the object of the attack of the individual against the system which they administer. This has its effect. I hope at all times we, and Canadians as a whole, will have that sense of responsibility and not aim our attacks at the force unless there has been, on their part, an injustice perpetrated by them. In that case the other members of the force are generally the first and most immediate judges.

One of the members of the present house, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg), was for a long time a distinguished member of that force, and his father before him. We have had other members of the force in this house. One was General Pearkes, and each and every one of them have served here as they did in the force, to the honour of their country.

I feel, and I am going to be perfectly frank about it, that having the R.C.M.P. act as traffic officers and the like, in carrying out their duties in urban municipalities, has not been in keeping with the tradition of that force, and has had effects that have not been entirely beneficial to the greatness of it. Having said that, I now want to say a word on the subject of national security.

I began by referring to the responsibilities that rest on the Prime Minister's shoulders. From time to time these matters are brought before the people. He carries in his head information in respect to the subject of security

that he is almost frightened at times of revealing. The Prime Minister has spoken of the difficulties.

How are you going to maintain security while at the same time preserving and maintaining the fundamental rights of the individual? It is a difficult problem. It is so easy to criticize, but it is so much more difficult, having that responsibility, being desirous of maintaining those freedoms, to be able to carry out one's wishes. Loyalty is expected of all Canadians. It is imperative as a quality of public service.

The maintenance of security is of prime importance to the survival of the state. How often do cases come before a prime minister and he cannot go into the details in the House of Commons. You have the evidence. Often it is secondary evidence; sometimes it is hearsay. The accumulation of hearsay placed before one has an effect, no matter how one endeavours to adopt a judicial attitude.

There are many cases in which the loyalty of the individual is not in question. But that individual may still not be reliable as a security risk, as was stated a moment ago, because of defects in character which subject him to the danger of blackmail. It is in blackmail mainly, not in the greed of the individual as such, that espionage among non-professionals takes place. That was so in the Vassal case in the United Kingdom. It is a fertile field for recruiting by the U.S.S.R., where public servants are known to be the companions of homosexuals. Those are the people who are generally chosen by the U.S.S.R. in recruiting spies who are otherwise loyal people within their countries.

The fear of exposure, the danger that all of us feel that something in our past might be revealed, have a tremendous effect on the mind of the potential spy or the prospective dispenser of security information to the U.S.S.R. The human element is involved. Someone is brought before you who is suspected. He tells his story. If the story is an admission it is generally accompanied by the statement of the individual in question that he meant no wrong, but was acting in self-defence for the preservation of his reputation. Within our own country, in the time when I was prime minister, I do not recall any case in which the activating reason for participation by the individual was monetary gain. The promise of monetary gain from the U.S.S.R. to prospective spies is small indeed. The rewards are small and the dangers are great.

What can be done? The Prime Minister has reviewed this at length and in a dispassionate manner. When the Minister of Justice says this just began with this administration, he forgets we worked on it for