

been perpetrated during that difficult period we went through. It should need to be explained, for instance, how come RCMP officers were tenants in the apartment above that in which James Cross was held prisoner.

Mr. Speaker, all those questions will have to be answered. All these circumstances must be brought into light under which the government lost their heads. Because this is the kind of nonsense that happens when one loses one's head. And when on November 15 we heard the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and other ministers come one after the other to utter the most horrendous stupidities, they proved once more they were losing their heads. It is a dangerous thing to be governed by people who lose their heads. This is why the people must be informed. Hypocrisy must be exposed. We must know exactly who we are dealing with, what kind of people we have as a government, because in my view they are getting less and less worthy of it.

So, and I would conclude on this, let not the Solicitor General think that we do not want to be constructive. We do want to be constructive to the extent we want the government to get out of there. After abusing their powers, after tampering directly with individual freedoms, they have no right to be there any more. This is being constructive. When the people find that some government went contrary to the bill of rights itself it is in my view a very constructive step to get rid of individuals that are now trampling on liberty and democracy in this country.

● (2122)

[English]

**Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my hon. friend, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox). I agree with the previous speaker, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte), that the Solicitor General did not really come to grips with the substance of what we are discussing here tonight.

I must say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that the Solicitor General is wrong when he suggests that we are trying to try the RCMP in the House of Commons. What we are seeking to do is to get information about this incompetent government. The Solicitor General has said, in effect, that we have not dealt so far with matters of substance. Well, he is a fine one to say that under the circumstances, but I want to assure him that I and members of my party do in fact have matters of substance and policy which we have worked on, and which we are prepared to put forward at any time. But I think it is asking a bit much tonight, under the circumstances, for me personally to make the type of speech I intended to make, in which I intended to bring up, among other things, some of the background of the RCMP, as this force has evolved from a territorial force into our national police force, with constitutional complications in the process.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there are, as it is becoming more and more evident, complications between Section 92(14) of the BNA Act, which gives exclusive jurisdiction over the administration of justice to the provinces, and some other sections,

### RCMP

such as perhaps Section 91(7), which do not, in my opinion, necessarily give the RCMP the kind of mandate which it has had to assume because of the neglect of this government in implementing some of the recommendations of the Mackenzie commission, which were made ten years ago.

I intended to deal, Mr. Speaker, with a lot of other matters of substance; to put forward my thoughts on why the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General of Quebec Marc-André Bédard, has found it necessary apparently to threaten to put the RCMP under the Quebec police commission; as to why the Solicitor General of Alberta, Mr. Foster, has had to complain publicly at the highest levels of the RCMP about the kind of intrusion into provincial jurisdiction which the force and federal authorities have found it necessary for their purposes to perpetrate. I had intended to do a lot of these things, Mr. Speaker, but under the circumstances, in view of some of the relations which have come forward, I want to say a few things tonight about my own experiences in the House, and about the lack of frankness and the lack of facts which I have encountered.

I want to say to the Solicitor General that when he deals with facts I will stake my record in this House against his.

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

**Mr. MacKay:** The former solicitor general seems to have something to say about that; I hope he will say it later on. I think it would be useful to remind the House, as we are now considering a time frame extending back to the 1970's, that the solicitors general, some of whom are sitting opposite, have had ample opportunity in the House to respond truthfully to specific questions from this side of the House. In fact I want to cite now an example where I was given false information, but being a good natured type, as every member of this House knows, I did not want to make an issue out of it.

I refer to an incident which took place on February 2, 1976, where I questioned the basis on which the security services were dealing with a man named Mitchell Bronfman, and where indeed circumstances were such that Mr. Bronfman contemplated suing the force, the security services, for their activities. The parliamentary secretary to the solicitor general of that day said to me—I will not repeat all of his remarks because they are in *Hansard*. Some of them suggest that I should have my head examined for even bringing this up.

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

**An hon. Member:** Then sit down.

**Mr. MacKay:** I see some members opposite agree. If I should have my head examined, Mr. Speaker, then I leave it to the Canadian public to say what should be done with members opposite. The parliamentary secretary to the then solicitor general told me, as reported at page 10562 of *Hansard*:

With respect to the earlier matter of whether Mr. Bronfman was persuaded to drop legal proceedings for defamation . . . against certain RCMP personnel, the Solicitor General has received no information on this.