

were to the effect that "I praise them because they helped to avert a civil war." There is no evidence that a civil war would have occurred without the intervention of that monster from the east, the Soviet Union. Also the Prime Minister went on to say:

We have no evidence of Soviet troops shaking their sabres on the border.

Where was the man? Was he asleep? Did he fail to recognize that on the day before September 13, the commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact was in Warsaw giving directions to their vassals? Did he fail to recognize that for months before the Russian military might had been mounted on the border of Poland, shaking, their sabres so that everyone in the world could hear? They seem to have done that to the escape of the attention of a member of the House who professes to be a champion of the people of Poland. This is offensive to me because it lacks real substance. I should like to have him stand up in his place and condemn the perpetrators of this evil. This has not happened and it is time it did.

If we listen to the comments of the hon. member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle), we are confronted with a variety of slants. It is time that the House began to recognize a slant which has taken place in Canada where we are blind to aggressive moves by a power which is determined to destroy our systems around the world and has used in the process well-meaning intellectuals who believe that the best thing we can do is to throw up our hands and surrender because it is a horrible offence to protect ourselves against a potential enemy. There is no doubt that there is an enemy there. It is an enemy which has proved itself historically from the beginning of the time when Lenin and his gang of thugs took over the Soviet Union.

We have seen just recently what occurs when a nation has no defence. Had the Falkland Islands been armed to the teeth, it would never have been invaded by the nation which perpetrated that invasion. Argentina would never have sent its ships, airplanes and its men against the Falkland Islands had it been defended. It is important to bear in mind that we in the House ought not to have to experience first-hand what happens when a country is ill-prepared. We should take some guidance and gain prudence from what has happened elsewhere. We have a mighty nation spread over a great continent with hundreds of miles of unprotected territory. For people to suggest that it is appropriate for us in some way to throw down our defences and join some peace pact, knowing that those monsters lurk out there from the Soviet Union, is an abandonment of reason.

I submit with respect to this issue that our place is within NATO and that we have an obligation to protect our country. To fly off in fits of fancy, trying to imagine a better world for all men and women, is to reject common sense and good reason. I submit to the House that the issues which confront us today are those to which the House should direct its attention. We should prepare ourselves and strengthen the Western World. We should not condemn those who join with us in providing the best protection for ourselves and for those other freedom-loving people around this planet.

Adjournment Debate

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being ten o'clock p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 58(11) proceedings on the motion have expired.

• (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—LEGAL COSTS INCURRED BY
EXONERATED NURSE. (B) LAW REFORM COMMISSION
RECOMMENDATIONS

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, if I may go back just a wee bit, my colleague, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Ellis) asked a question of the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Kaplan) on May 26, 1982, relating to the question of compensation for costs incurred on behalf of Miss Susan Nelles for her prosecution on four counts of murder from which she was not only discharged by a judge in Toronto but was, in fact, exonerated in the course of that judgment.

The answer given by the Solicitor General at that time was:

Madam Speaker, as the House knows, the administration of justice is a provincial matter. The investigation and the charges that were laid were all done under the direction of the provincial authorities. I think, with respect and with the sympathy, that I share for her plight, the hon. member should direct his attention to the government responsible for the decision and for the prosecution.

I give that by way of background information.

That answer disturbed me a great deal; the fact that there should be an attempt to slough off what I would like to tell the House what I believe is a moral responsibility on the basis of the British North America Act as to what is the responsibility of the province and the federal government.

On May 28, 1982, I raised the matter again in the House of Commons. I asked the Solicitor General whether or not, given the responsibility that certainly lies with Ontario, there was not a moral responsibility with respect to the judicial system of the country and especially the criminal law system of the country for some compensation with respect to costs for a person found in the position of Miss Susan Nelles of Belleville. On that occasion the minister went farther than he did with the hon. member for Prince Edward Hastings. He said:

—I will note the hon. member's representation and I will bring it to the attention of my colleague, the Attorney General of Canada.

I asked him another question and his answer was:

—I note the hon. member's point. I will bring it to my colleague's attention.

In the blues that I saw, "colleague's" had the apostrophe after the "s" which would have meant his colleagues, the members