

fundamental rule in Canadian law that a criminal must not be allowed to profit from his crimes. This rule has been violated and a very dangerous precedent has been set. Twisted minds may decide to kill for profit. Others may be induced to confess to crimes they did not commit.

All of us understand the anguish that the parents felt in these circumstances. I am a member from British Columbia and I know the pressure on the police, but this kind of payment cannot be tolerated. I was approached by the parents of one of the murdered children who asked me why that man was able to profit from the death of their child?

Other questions must be raised in the course of an inquiry about the nature of this investigation. Why was Clifford Olson not under detailed and intensive surveillance from the moment he became a prime suspect on July 15, 1981? In view of his record and in view of the fact that he was a prime suspect, why was he not under the most intensive form of surveillance? Inspector Proke says, frankly, he cannot tell why the delay occurred. Other questions have been raised. Was Olson on the RCMP payroll at any point as an informer? Was there an accomplice working with Olson on some of these murders? Why was this man not behind bars in view of certain charges made against him and in view of his lengthy record. There are many questions which remain unanswered in the Clifford Olson saga, such as the circumstances of the payment and the manner in which the investigation was handled.

● (2225)

I would very seriously suggest that if the Solicitor General does not respond to this strong outcry by Canadians from coast to coast and order a public inquiry to settle some of these serious questions, he will bring the office of the Solicitor General into disrepute and he will have no alternative but to resign forthwith.

**Hon. Robert Kaplan (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has added very little to the questions which he raised in the House this afternoon during question period. I think I gave my answers to those questions at that time. I want to take advantage of the opportunity, however, to indicate why I think a public inquiry into the police investigation would be highly undesirable.

There were three or four prime suspects who were being watched by the police, and there were a great many other people who had accusations brought against them. If there were to be a public inquiry, the public would have to be informed as to who those other suspects were and what the evidence was against them, which was false evidence in some cases, and how the police weighed that evidence in making a decision as to whether it was Olson or whether it was them.

### *Adjournment Debate*

One might say that we could bring the evidence forward but leave out the names of the suspect. However, if one leaves the names out and includes their addresses, places of business, and associates, which were all very important in assessing their possible responsibility in the matter, they would be identified. I think it would be extremely unfair to the other suspects of these murders, who were cleared when Olson was convicted, to bring forward the cases against them which led the police to consider them to be suspects.

If one wanted to assess how the police were doing, and why, until they charged Olson, they thought he might either be guilty or innocent, one would have to know what they thought they had against the other people. One would have to name them or give their names and addresses, which would amount to the same thing, in order to make it possible to review the judgment that the police were exercising in the case.

Then one would have to involve the parents of many, many children in the area where these crimes were committed, those parents who came forward and told the police their children had been the victims of sexual assaults of one kind or another. One would have to give their names in order that the public inquiry could understand why their evidence was important; or, if one left their names out, one would have to give their addresses or something of their descriptions, such as where they worked and how it was that these four suspects and others who were accused came into contact with them.

I think when one indicates what happens when a police report is made public, it is obvious why it should not be made public. If the parents of a child who was a victim or thought to be a victim of a sexual offence came to the police, knowing that in the following few weeks the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) would have the right to have that information made public and broadcast across the country, even if their names, their address and their places of work were omitted, what kind of public inquiry could we have?

This is a case where the attorney general of a province and the Solicitor General of Canada share a responsibility. Their duties are different, but they have this responsibility because it would be unfair and wrong, as well as disruptive and destructive of police operations, for inquiries of this sort to be made public. I think police work would be very seriously deteriorated if this information was made public, even with names and identifications expurgated to avoid prejudice. This just would not mean anything to anyone who wanted to assess it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.