

Security

Howie says he doesn't condone any illegality and he isn't advocating suppression of "any legitimate allegations of wrongdoing against the RCMP or any federal agency."

That is nice.

The article goes on to read:

But it's the federal government's responsibility to defend the reputation of the force and bring in whatever "corrective measures" may be required, he says, and he blames the Trudeau government for giving the force "a very broad mandate in both domestic and national security matters without the necessary guidelines, supporting legal authority and economic resources to fulfil it".

It is a well known fact in this House that the opposition has had made available to it three briefings on national security, and members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs can, at their request, whenever they wish, have briefings with the chief overseers of security in the public service. I refer to Mr. Robin Bourne and Major General Dare. Such briefings were held on at least three dates that I know of, May 24, 1973; May 2, 1974; and May 7, 1975. To my knowledge, and from the research I have been able to do in the past few days, they have not taken advantage of any security briefings since that day. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) extended to the Leader of the Opposition the courtesy of being briefed on national security matters, a courtesy which has not been accepted. The Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to make at least two major speeches in this House in the past few weeks on the irresponsibility of the government and the RCMP on national security matters when he does not know what he is talking about.

● (2142)

We have heard repeatedly today there is no effort on the part of the opposition to condemn the RCMP. They say they support the RCMP. Let us look at the record. I refer to a speech made on October 31 by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He said as reported at page 496 of *Hansard*:

—I say the RCMP have to be brought to heel.

That is not a condemnation by the RCMP in their terms! They will bring in another apologist to try to eradicate that statement.

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) said:

How do we address ourselves to the young people of this country when, on one hand, three law enforcement officers, presumably instructed by officials senior to them to break the law, are exonerated, when a 14 or 17 year old who breaks and enters a public or private residence is given two days, two weeks, two months, or whatever the sentence may be?

No one on this side of the House advocates breaking the law. There is a principle in the criminal law called the principle of hot pursuit. It permits police officers in active pursuit of criminals to continue their pursuit, even if it means breaking into a residence or building, or going outside of their limited jurisdiction.

In New Brunswick, for example, town police are now authorized in hot pursuit to go beyond the boundaries of the town in which they are the police officers in order to make an apprehension. Perhaps it is time that theory applied to the

[Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi).]

security force of this nation. However, that is a matter for those more capable of interpreting the law than I.

Let us look at some of the other statements made by hon. members opposite. On October 31 the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) said:

The Solicitor General told us repeatedly that this particular group was not an operational group. We know better. As my hon. friend from the Yukon has clearly shown, this group is indeed an operational police force. It recruits and trains agents to provoke actions within unions and on university campuses, to infiltrate right wing and left wing societies, to encourage them to demonstrate on the streets, and to promote acts which are normally illegal.

Those are very serious charges. They were made by members of the opposition who have gone to pains today to claim that they support the RCMP. They challenged us today to indicate any instance when they condemned the RCMP. I say that is a condemnation.

He went on to say:

Now that we have an idea as to the kind of security forces which are operating in this country I ask the question: why is it necessary sometimes, as the Prime Minister says, for these agencies to break the law?

That is a legitimate question, one to which the government addressed itself. Later in his speech he said:

During the debate tonight, a number of my colleagues in the House stated they will have submissions to make to the royal commission, revealing some of the Machiavellian schemes.

They say our police force and our security force are Machiavellian.

They were not conceived by the opposition, but by the government and by some of the sick paranoid minds that operate within the security analysis group of the Solicitor General's office.

A lot of charges have been hurled about this place today. As I said before, the opposition has gone to great pains to try to paint themselves as lily white. However, their paintbrushes have had many of the bristles removed and they are leaving obvious streaks.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his contribution to this debate today, prejudged the results of the McDonald commission into the activities of the RCMP and the security service. He said the Prime Minister has already made a statement that the government would be guided by advice from the law officers of the Crown. I admit that the Prime Minister made that statement. It is an entirely legitimate statement. In fact if any minister of this government were to act in any legal matter without the advice of the law officers of the Crown, the opposition would raise outraged howls of indignation.

When the Prime Minister says that he is going to consult the law officers of the Crown, the Leader of the Opposition is upset. Apparently the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox), and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) are to make legal judgments without the benefit of law officers of the Crown.

The sinister aspect he applied to it was that the Prime Minister was building a cover for the Solicitor General previous to appearing before the McDonald commission. A few days ago the opposition was very indignant because the Prime Minister suggested they may be involved in a few shady deals.