

relatively brief. Indeed, I hope it will not be a debate, but I feel it necessary to speak on this proposition to adjourn because I think the members of this House are owed an explanation by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) regarding a matter that I raised yesterday afternoon and which he indicated at that time he would reply to, in his own words, as quickly as possible.

Instead of the appearance of the minister this afternoon in response to the document that I had asked to be tabled and to explain the interrogation techniques of the RCMP, we had a press release from the RCMP. The minister did not even come to the House or arrange through another minister, one acting in his stead, to offer an explanation for the highly derogatory, superficial, and I would say silly document presently in use by the RCMP.

This is not the first time that there has been, instead of a statement or some clarification by the minister in the House, the issuance, in this case late this afternoon, of a press release by the RCMP, which is an attempt to make some kind of self-serving explanation of the exact nature of the document about which I raised a question in the House yesterday, and to which I asked the minister to respond today.

In the explanation the RCMP does not try to deny the existence of this document. Indeed, it would be foolish in the extreme to deny that it exists. As I indicated yesterday, I already have coming to Ottawa a copy of an affidavit indicating the existence of this document and its current use by the RCMP. It is shocking that the minister should feel, for reasons that have not yet been explained by any government representative, that he should not come clean with this House and with the general public.

I know, from the reaction that I have had during the last 24 hours, that there is a considerable amount of shock among people generally not only at the techniques I mentioned yesterday in just a descriptive sense which are being practised, but also at the fact that they are included in a document issued by the RCMP entitled "Interrogation Techniques", by Chief Inspector A. R. Roberts of the Calgary City Police. This document is presently in use and is authorized, according to the frontispiece, for use in the training and development branch, headquarters, Ottawa.

It might be interesting for members of the House to hear some parts of this document so as to give members an idea of the current level of instruction which, according to the press release made late this afternoon by the RCMP, is part of a course that is offered senior investigators with between five and 15 years of experience.

This is not a document that is used in some introductory sense for students who are training at the main RCMP training centre in Regina but, as confirmed by the RCMP themselves late this afternoon, a document in use by senior investigators. We are not talking here about some peripheral document of which some individuals may be aware; we are talking about a document that is accepted in current practice by the more important investigators in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

If that be the case, then it is absolutely unacceptable that this House should be asked to adjourn this afternoon for a period of some 10 days to two weeks without being given a proper explanation by the Solicitor General of the

Easter Adjournment

basis on which this kind of document has been authorized and accepted for use.

● (1710)

I hope that before we come to the hour of adjournment either the government House leader or the minister who responds on behalf of the Solicitor General will be able to offer a satisfactory explanation to this House and the Canadian people. If that does not happen I for one will be most reluctant to see this House adjourn today. I would want to have an opportunity for the minister to come to this House tomorrow, or at the earliest possible moment, to indicate, first of all, how any justification can be given for this most illiberal document to be used as a regular training manual for the RCMP, and whether he in fact is aware of it. It would seem clear from his short answer yesterday that he was not aware of it, and I would hope that during the time that has elapsed he has had an opportunity to study it and is now taking action to withdraw it and replace it with one that is acceptable to the Canadian people as being just and fair.

Members may wonder at the kind of document this is, and I am going to take a few minutes to give hon. members an idea of what is in the context of it, and I am sure the House will be most tolerant and interested to know . . .

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would hope the hon. member will not open a full debate on the subject matter he is raising. Actually what is before the House at this time is a motion to adjourn for a definite period of time, and I do not think I can really allow the hon. member to take this opportunity to debate the basis of the point he is trying to make, or points relating to his complaint about answers or the fact that he did not receive answers from the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) or the government.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, this is not, as I hope to clarify, just a question of asking for information. This is a question that involves the basic protection of civil rights in this country and the methods being participated in at the moment by the national police force of this country, the RCMP. If in fact any individual member could feel that it is fair or is justified to his constituents that we press for an early adjournment before we have this matter sensibly resolved and settled, I for one would be most willing to hear from him.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, if hon. members want to interrupt it will just take me longer to get through the material I want to present to the House as an argument against adjourning until such time as either the government House leader or the Solicitor General, or a spokesman on their behalf, clarifies this situation.

I do not like to stand during this period which is normally the pro forma ritual of adjourning the House. Knowing the Solicitor General and respecting him as I do, I had felt from the outset that he would be more than willing to resolve this matter immediately. Since the document is available, and not in some far outpost but here in