

*Adjournment Debate*

background, and considerations that exist in the matter of Messrs. McCleery and Brunet. I would also be very interested in asking the Solicitor General at this point how many other such instances have come to the attention of his office since he assumed his portfolio. But we can perhaps pursue that at another time.

I would suggest to the Solicitor General, without going into excessive detail, that many of the problems in which McCleery and Brunet were unfortunate to find themselves were caused by a misunderstanding and arbitrary approach by certain RCMP officials in their particular case.

The minister was neither right nor very careful in his answer to me a couple of days ago when he said that McCleery and Brunet were before Judge Marin's commission, implying that the purpose for which they were there had to do with the issues I raised. In point of fact, as the Solicitor General will discover if he checks carefully, Brunet was never before Judge Marin. McCleery was, but his purpose, as I understand it, was to outline some of the deficiencies and injustices in the way in which members of the force were treated, presumably to prevent others being treated like he was. McCleery felt then, and must still feel, that it is a simple matter of justice that members of the RCMP be afforded protection and a chance to have a fair hearing and answer any charges made against them.

If the Solicitor General is as concerned with matters of conscience and philosophy as he maintains he is, and I believe he is, he should want the people of Canada to believe that he would be interested enough and have sufficient control over his department to make sure that this matter, which may be a continuing injustice, is resolved.

He ought to realize the paradox in expecting police officers to have the proper attitude for the rights of others and to uphold our laws when they themselves are not afforded the same rights as other Canadians in matters of fundamental protection for themselves.

● (2220)

I say to the minister sincerely that unfortunately it is becoming apparent that he is not running his department, that his department is running him. He is not giving the guidance and direction to the RCMP that a man in his position should. If there is any department of government that the people of Canada cannot afford to have running itself, it is this particular department over which the Solicitor General has jurisdiction.

I am further suggesting to the minister and to the House that the one reason Messrs. McCleery and Brunet were ultimately discharged—although no one has yet had the decency to give them their discharge papers, which I believe in itself is contrary to the RCMP Act—is that no one on the force would take the responsibility of issuing the proper orders to either one of these gentlemen to cease the so called activities which were used as a justification for their discharge.

To be more specific, when assistant commissioner Gorman, as he then was and still is, made his investigation which finally led to their discharge pursuant to section 173 of the RCMP Act, he first recommended that they be transferred. However, a series of events changed the atti-

tude of the force and led to the unfortunate situation which now exists.

It is also interesting that, at the time of the investigation, assistant commissioner Gorman refused to give an order that these two officers should have had, if that indeed was to be a serious offence, to desist from any contact with Mitchell Bronfman. Mitchell Bronfman, by the way, was on occasion of some assistance, and may still be, to the security service division of the RCMP, a fact which the minister can easily determine if he wishes to check the proper records. But that is another story.

The national crime intelligence unit, which either lacks the basic understanding of the situation or did not interpret it properly, amassed a lot of information which was and is demonstrably false, unsupported and speculative, and will not stand up to any competent and impartial analysis.

The investigation concerned more than simply the alleged misconduct of Brunet and McCleery. It involved, among other things, the true status of Mitchell Bronfman. The investigation at times assumed almost a comic opera atmosphere. Superintendent Marcoux flew to British Columbia on a supposedly ultra secret mission to check into certain aspects, and I suppose he was quite perplexed when he came back to Ottawa when he received a call from Brunet asking him how the weather was in British Columbia.

I would think that even in an organization which, justifiably, is not known for having a sense of humour, this should have brought at least a smile to the officer's face, but apparently this was not the case judging from what happened as a result.

I suggest that up to the point that Gilles Brunet telephoned superintendent Marcoux on this occasion the worst that was slated for him was a transfer to Newfoundland—Grand Falls as a matter of fact—which apparently was going to be sufficiently distant from the baleful influence of his associate, Don McCleery, who was slated to be transferred at the same time to Moncton, New Brunswick.

However, because of Gilles Brunet's telephone call to see how the investigation was proceeding—an investigation which concerned him—and about Don McCleery about whom he had no word for weeks, because of the audacity of this simple act which was the only recourse he had under the circumstances, and he was understandably curious, I am suggesting that was one reason why what was supposed to be a transfer, and perhaps a rap on the knuckles, turned into a discharge from the force with tremendous consequences and implications for these men. I therefore feel responsible for directing questions to the minister on the status of the company which they are using as a vehicle, and which also involves Mitchell Bronfman.

I see you are indicating that my time is up, Madam Speaker, so I will finish briefly by suggesting to the Solicitor General that he make every effort to look into this matter on a more factual and detailed basis and, if possible, as soon as we come back in the fall—if we have a recess—arrange for these gentlemen to come before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to give their testimony and tell us their story.

[Mr. MacKay.]