

under cover to put some of these rotters in jail where they belong? Those are questions for which the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General have no real answers.

An hon. Member: That goes back to Goyer.

Mr. Leggatt: I am aware of that. I am waiting with an open mind to hear the minister's defence of the attack which he and his predecessors have made in the area of organized crime. I would be interested in hearing what his staff allocations are. I would be happy if he told us how many in the Ottawa detachment have as their sole responsibility an attack on organized crime, versus the number who have responsibility in terms of subversive activity in Canada. The minister might be persuaded to change the balance of his forces in terms of attacking organized crime.

Those are the two reasons which have been given in opposition to the call for a royal commission. The validity is not there. I should like to indicate some of the reasons it is useful to have a royal commission. First of all, Al Capone was not put in jail because he killed anybody; he was put in jail because the United States enforcement authorities decided that he was a kingpin in organized crime and they determined that he was no longer going to carry on those activities in the United States. They convicted him of evading income tax. That is how they imprisoned Al Capone.

● (1530)

What is the use of talking about provincial and federal jurisdictions? Why say, "Let British Columbia have its own royal commission and let Quebec have its own royal commission?" Has the federal government no say when there are violations of our immigration laws or income tax laws? I say this because organized crime likes to evade income tax. We should not insist on splitting responsibility, as it were. We may not be able to catch some of the kingpins of organized crime unless the federal authority enforces offences against the Income Tax Act, for instance.

Anyone with experience in the field will concede the extreme difficulty of nailing the kingpins of organized crime. Most of these people do not bother using the telephone. Someone ought to tell the minister: I think the force knows it. I suggest the wiretap law on which the government seems to rely so heavily is not the most effective instrument for combating organized crime. If you took the earphones off some of our policemen, and put them on the streets to do undercover and investigate work of the sort our CBC reporters have done, for example, you would get convictions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Ramsay Clark, when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs in 1973, pointed out the difficulties of the wiretap law. He said the police would use it as a crutch and lean on it so heavily that they would neglect the undercover, dangerous work which must be done, the work which we give the police tremendous credit for doing. The government is responsible for allocating

Organized Crime

resources to the police properly and appropriately. No one in this House says we should not have a wiretap law but, we say it should be a balanced wiretap law.

If the minister's response to organized crime is, "Give us more evidentiary rules, expand two sections in the offences section of the code and we will clean up organized crime," one can only say his response is inadequate. We want the government to adopt a co-ordinated approach. We want to see the Minister of Justice involved in prosecutions, and the Solicitor General in law enforcement. As well, we want to see some indication of an increase in the allocation to the force. Perhaps the minister will announce today his intention to increase the allocation. The opposition knows this is an expensive business. I know of one investigation, concerning one figure, which is costing \$1.5 million per year. The Canadian people will back any minister who says, "I am not going to apologize for this spending. I am looking ahead in our fight against organized crime."

We do not want the minister to defend the bureaucracy and the force. We all love the force. That's a motherhood question in Canada. Everyone wants to see the RCMP working effectively and well. It is the minister's responsibility to give direction which will protect the force's reputation as one of the best police forces in the world. And, I say it is one of the best in the world. But unless the minister changes his attitude, it will be in trouble.

What are the other arguments in favour of a royal commission? There is reluctance on the part of politicians at any time to look at themselves in relation to organized crime.

Mr. Woolliams: Why?

Mr. Leggatt: The examples in the United States on this subject are legion. Justice must not only be done; it must appear to be done. That is an old legal cliché. The House of Commons is the wrong place to examine organized crime in detail. It must be done by a royal commission. We have undertaken inquiries into various matters. Of necessity to itself, organized crime tries to infiltrate the political arena. As someone said today, I think, you never know who has made a contribution to your campaign. You have to be very careful about where the money comes from.

A royal commission does not have its hands tied politically. It can act on the question of organized crime. The request for a royal commission is not new. Government members have suggested in this House that the opposition just discovered organized crime after watching a couple of hours of television. There have been calls for a royal commission going back to 1973. Various members of this House have made the request. Therefore, this is not a new idea of the opposition's; it is not something we have just discovered. We want the government to respond to a problem the Canadian people have faced for five or six years, and it is getting worse every year.

What has been the United States experience? As I said, many of their kingpins were caught because they violated U.S. income tax law. During the 1950s and the 1960s, U.S. authorities found that their attack on organized crime was ineffective