

ing essentially matters of sabotage, espionage from outside the country—

An hon. Member: Burning barns.

Mr. Fox:—matters of subversion, and matters of terrorism. Hon. members opposite can say what they want, but the question of terrorism, either national or international, as recent events around the world have shown, is a real concern to all democratic countries. There is, of course, the whole matter of foreign intelligence operations in and against this country. There are the essential elements of the mandate the government has given to the security service of Canada. It is an extremely important mandate: the continued well-being of this Confederation and of our Canadian society depends on it.

However, since hon. members opposite wish to home in on some of the unfortunate events which have happened within the security service over the past years—incidents which cannot be condoned in any way whatsoever—I would like also to remind hon. members of the thousands of operations which have been carried on on a day-to-day basis by members of the security service of this country.

Why is it that we can only speak about the things which do not work out? Why is it that we can never speak of the magnificent job done by—

An hon. Member: Come off it, Fox.

Mr. Fox: The opposition does not like to hear me speak of the good work done by the security service. The opposition does not want me to talk about the magnificent job the security service, and the RCMP in general, did during the course of the Olympics in Montreal. The opposition does not want to hear what other security services around the world had to say about the magnificent security requirements which were fulfilled by the RCMP during the course of those Olympics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre: We liked the musical ride, too. Get to the point.

Mr. Fox: Nor do they mention the work of the security service as far as foreign intelligence operations are concerned. We have not heard them mention the incident in which certain Cubans were sent out of this country as a result of the work of the security service.

● (2052)

Nor have we heard them mention the case of the Japanese Red Army agent deported from this country last year because of the excellent work of the security service.

Mr. Broadbent: That has nothing to do with the debate.

Mr. Fox: Let us get back to some of the basic facts in this matter. It is far too serious a matter for me to indulge in the kind of childish play in which the opposition is indulging.

RCMP

Last July the Government of Canada set up a royal commission of inquiry into the practices and procedures of the RCMP. Why, Mr. Speaker? The answer is quite clear.

Mr. Broadbent: You had no choice.

Mr. Fox: The reason the commission was appointed at that time was clearly because a number of complaints were made to me as Solicitor General following an initial statement made in the House on June 17 concerning the APLQ incident. At that time these complaints were examined. Some had the appearance of being founded in fact, and the government thought it absolutely essential, as the Commissioner of the RCMP also thought it essential, for the reputation of the RCMP, that these matters be brought to light and examined by an independent and impartial outside body.

Hon. members opposite suggest that every complaint that has come in since that time—and there have been many complaints come in since that time concerning the criminal investigations side of the RCMP, concerning the security services side of the RCMP—what the opposition is suggesting tonight is that I try these people on the floor of the House of Commons. They suggest I divulge names here and that I reveal to the House every complaint. That is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) suggested, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: We called for an inquiry.

Mr. Fox: He suggested I reveal tonight the totality of complaints made against the RCMP since the month of July. That would amount to trying people on the floor of the House of Commons, without the opportunity to defend themselves completely.

The opposition suggested during the course of debate that we should set up the commission of inquiry. It was eventually set up so that these matters could be looked into and examined by an outside, impartial body. If the RCMP had examined the complaints themselves we would have heard the cry from the other side of the room that it would not be an independent or impartial examination. Now we have established a royal commission, with a judge and two commissioners, to take evidence under oath and cross-examine.

It has escaped the attention of members opposite that the commission also can do something that is extremely important, and that is to give the individuals in question the right to a full defence, the right to explain their actions, and let it be known exactly why they acted in the manner they did.

It has also been made quite clear that in the event any evidence came forward to the commission of an illegal act, those matters would be brought to the attention of the relevant prosecutorial authorities. That matter is very clear.

The opposition says that the terms of reference of the commission of inquiry are not wide enough. If they would only read the terms of reference of the inquiry they would see that those terms are extremely wide.