

*Security*

The change in security came about when this government set up the planning security branch composed of civilians, which interferes with the good work and traditions of the RCMP, which we on this side of the House supported. Like the right hon. member for Prince Albert and our former leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), I have supported them over the years.

**Mr. Harquail:** Apologize to the RCMP.

**Mr. Woolliams:** My friend should apologize to the Canadian people. The parliamentary secretary should restrain himself. I rose on a point of order this afternoon. I did not yell from my seat. I try to keep my brains in a little higher area of my anatomy.

The Minister of Justice attacked the official opposition over the weekend on the basis of what he would like our position to be. He would like to pretend that we on this side do not believe in a strong and effective police force who want to achieve their aims by legal means, not by terrorism, kidnapping and assassination. He would like to pretend that the Conservative party is not proud of the job done by the RCMP at the Olympics and that the RCMP will not get our support and respect.

He would love to be able to show the opposition as unrealistic, naïve, and unwittingly supportive of subversive elements in the country. In fact he wants this to be our position so badly that he assures his gullible Liberal friends that it is our position, and then he attacks it mercilessly. This is known as knocking down a straw man.

However, he made a slip in his presentation. He said it is fundamental to the rule of the law and the protection of civil liberties that they, the police, operate under the law. Presto—the minister repeated the essence of the opposition case. Obedience to the law by the security forces is not just nice or sometimes convenient, but fundamental. Is the minister about to cross the floor? Is he going to take the opposite position that he is against the police? That is what he is suggesting, and he is accusing us of being against the RCMP. I say to him that all the evidence is the opposite. The responsibility is on the government. This is merely a plot to take the responsibility and the heat off their own shoulders because of their irresponsibility and culpability in this matter.

**Mr. Harquail:** So says the opposition.

**Mr. Woolliams:** The government would also have everyone believe that we are advocating political interference with the course of sensitive investigations, and that we are in favour of giving politicians access, willy-nilly, to whatever is turned up. An ingenious perversion of the truth!

The minister said we are not going to have political manipulation of the police force. Nobody ever suggested that. Not even the Liberals suggested that. We only want some accountability. The minister said they are not going to be pushed into that sort of thing by the opposition, or by anyone. The brave Minister of Justice! Will there be a single straw man left standing when his courageous purge of heresies is completed?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

He knows full well that the question at issue is the responsibility of ministers for defining in general terms the ends and means of their departments, to set the tone. No one has suggested that a Solicitor General should interfere in day-to-day police work, or demand access to security and criminal files as the whim takes him. Can the minister not tell the difference between ministerial responsibility and ministerial interference?

However, we must show some sympathy for the dilemma the minister faced. He could not have gathered a standing ovation from his audience by telling the truth. The one thing he did accomplish is to get a pie in the face.

**Mrs. Campagnolo:** Do you think he is lying?

**Mr. Harquail:** Are you calling him a liar?

**Mr. Fraser:** Yes, he is. Nowhere did we ever say what he alleged was said.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has the floor for the purpose of making a speech, and I suggest we all listen.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Perhaps when I am asked about whether he is lying, I can sum it up in the words of Francis Bacon, "Nothing does more hurt in a state than that a cunning man pass for wise." That may be the answer to the question.

**Mr. Harquail:** That is not Bacon; it is yourself, ham and eggs.

**Mr. Woolliams:** According to Dicey, all ministers, whether they be in or outside the cabinet, are responsible for their personal acts, the general conduct of their departments, and acts done in their name by the departmental officials. If a minister is personally blameworthy, he ought to make a public admission of his responsibility. That is all we are asking.

Dicey said, unless the Prime Minister is unwilling to stand by the minister under attack, a minister may choose, and has not infrequently chosen in recent years, to brazen out appalling indiscretions. That is what this government has done on this issue. It has brazened out appalling indiscretions of its own responsibility which it has shelved and put on the shoulders of the RCMP.

Only a short time ago this government was removing words from RCMP cars across this nation. They took off words from various police stations in this country. We stood and defended the RCMP. They were against them. Now they want to move it across to the other side of the House.

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

**Mr. Harquail:** Diefenbaker wants to apologize; why don't you join him?

**Mr. Woolliams:** Dicey said, and I quote:

The point, however, which should never be forgotten is this: it is now well established law that the Crown can act only through ministers and according to certain prescribed forms which absolutely require the co-operation of some