

sixth instance, and what kind of mentality is there in this government that they should believe the people of Canada would call that kind of conduct defensible? I suggest that they misread the people of this country in terms of civil rights and the operation of law.

Who else is being investigated and has been investigated by the RCMP under the responsibility of the Solicitor General of Canada? Is it the NDP that they have investigated; is it the Progressive Conservative Party that they have investigated; is it some other agency that their paranoia has caused them to investigate?

The other question I have is how much knowledge, in this case, did the security and analysis group, which is right in the Solicitor General's office, have with respect to the matter that the RCMP was involved in; and if they did not have any knowledge, they had better come forward and say so, because there is no one here who will accept that?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** There is no one anywhere who will believe the tripe that we have heard coming from the mouth of the former solicitor general, now the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), the solicitor general previous to him, now Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Allmand), and the present Solicitor General who had to stand up and make that abject speech in the House today. There is no one who would believe that they could be so incompetent as not to know; and even if they were so incompetent, then they should not hold that office. We have just removed the lid on Pandora's box of security, snooping, bugging and illegality in this country, and we serve notice on the government right now that we do not intend to let this matter rest until it is all hung out.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Would the hon. member permit a brief question? In view of what he is now saying, would he not agree that the McDonald inquiry should now be out in the open?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I thank the hon. member, because he has anticipated what I was going to say with respect to the McDonald inquiry. I have just had put in my hands a copy of *Hansard* of June 22, 1977, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) asked that the Chief Justice of Canada be empowered to appoint a judicial inquiry, and that the judicial inquiry be empowered not only to act within the terms of reference of the present McDonald inquiry, but to investigate the question of the legal and moral responsibility and the liability of this government in terms of the operations of the Department of the Solicitor General and the RCMP. What was asked? We asked the simple question. It is not known. The preamble to that question was the same preamble that was used for the Dorion inquiry which the force of public

*The Address—Mr. W. Baker*

opinion finally drove into a public, open inquiry although the supporters of the government that day said no.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, that inquiry should be public. There is no way it can be kept secret now, and no justification for it. When it comes about that a federal government agency investigates a political party, then surely if we are a democracy and if we preach and practise openness in government, then openness in investigation in those circumstances is the only proper, honourable and moral course to take. The self-serving statement of the Solicitor General, on page 8 of the text, says:

● (1422)

After having made inquiries into these allegations at the insistence of the government the commissioner of the RCMP advised—

Does the Solicitor General not recall the questions which were put to him in the House of Commons day after day by the opposition parties? Does he not recall being asked and pushed by the opposition in this House for the kind of inquiry we wanted and called for on June 22—a full, open, public and broad inquiry—not only into the RCMP but also into the responsibility of the minister and his colleagues? Does he not recall that?

I am sure the Canadian public recalls it. I am sure it occupied enough of the front pages of the metropolitan newspapers in this country that the Canadian public is not so selectively amnesiac as the Solicitor General. Nobody believes the Solicitor General when he says it was at the insistence of the government. It was at the insistence of the members of this House who occupy the opposition benches.

**Mr. Fox:** It refers to the allegations that came in after the first statement.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** The minister had his chance to make a speech. He made his speech and he is now hung with it. When the history of this time is written—

**Mr. Fox:** You don't know what you are talking about, again.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**—and the minister reads *Hansard*, he will find that the only reason we got this paltry investigation was that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and other parties in the House of Commons insisted that it come about.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Fox:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Once again the hon. member is distorting the facts because he has no knowledge of the facts. Perhaps that is not his fault, but if he is really interested in the truth and in what happened after my initial statement in the House in the month of June, a number of allegations were brought to my attention, and I asked—and the government asked—the Commissioner of the RCMP to investigate those allegations. That is what the statement the hon. member just quoted refers to. Once again the hon. member is trying to distort the facts, which he cannot do because he does not know the facts.