

*Organized Crime*

**Mr. Fox:** I cannot believe it.

**Mr. Leggatt:** I am sure he will get up and apologize for the RCMP, as he has done since the time he attained his portfolio. His job is not to apologize for the RCMP. His job is not to defend the RCMP, and it is not to defend bureaucracy. His job is to provide leadership in crime enforcement in Canada. In terms of the RCMP, he is the law enforcement officer. He is the person who should exercise his political clout over that force. He should move that force forward in terms of organized crime. During the course of this debate I will talk about the way we can go about doing that.

We have two ministers in this House, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Solicitor General, who have said they oppose this motion for a royal commission. They have two grounds on which they oppose it. They are important men, and I take it they are very serious about those grounds. They say the provinces have the authority to set up their own commissions, and the provinces can deal with this matter. I should like to indicate that organized crime is transprovincial, transnational and international. As they discovered in the United States, if you are going to fight organized crime you cannot do it with little, local commissions which work at cross-purposes and do not relate their information in terms of the attack.

**Mr. Fox:** That is not the case in Canada.

**Mr. Leggatt:** The Solicitor General says that is not the case in Canada.

**An hon. Member:** We have never caught anyone yet.

**Mr. Leggatt:** We have never caught anyone involved in organized crime in Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Leggatt:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Fox:** That is not the situation in Canada.

**An hon. Member:** Let the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) talk. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) has had his say.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) has the floor. We will be here until six o'clock. We will all have our day in court.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Good idea.

**Mr. Leggatt:** The one thing organized crime is delighted with is this government's position of not going for a national royal commission. They are delighted with the fact that this government would rather see those commissions fractured and hived off into little distributions. They are pleased with the fact that each little commission will be chopping away at one little tentacle of the octopus, while the head stays intact, merrily doing its dirty work in Canada. That is the position of this government on a national royal commission: We will let the provinces do it and will abandon more jurisdiction to the

[Mr. Leggatt.]

provinces. They have been doing this since 1972. Our party is one party which is not going to abandon jurisdiction over law enforcement at the federal level, as this government is going to do.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Right on.

**Mr. Leggatt:** Their second argument seems to boggle the mind. They indicate that they will get these criminals and have the Five Dragons in jail in no time: The only thing which needs to be done is to pass the amendments to the wiretap act; they are keeping these people on the streets by being in opposition to our wiretap act amendments.

When that bill comes out of committee and the Liberal majority gets its way, as it usually does, and the bill is passed, we can expect to see all kinds of arrests by the fall. The Five Dragons will be behind bars, our friends in Montreal will be picked up off the streets, and there will be no problem at all. That is the argument which has been presented to this House, and it is the most specious, silly argument I have ever heard. It is a silly argument to say, because some minor amendments to the wiretap act have not been passed, that this government has been inhibited in regard to organized crime.

I should like to refer to the broad powers which the government says they do not have in order to deal with organized crime under the wiretap act. One of them deals with the question of the introduction of evidence. It can be argued and debated by lawyers as to whether it complicates the courts system and expands the time that is necessary. For a minister of the Crown to stand and seriously tell us that because he does not have that little amendment in terms of the evidentiary rule in court, he has not been able to successfully attack organized crime, is so specious as not to be worthy of serious attention.

**An hon. Member:** He should resign.

**Mr. Leggatt:** The second question the minister must deal with is the law which is in existence. I am sure the minister has looked at it, but I want to remind him of the existing wiretap law. Parliament gave this government the power to go out and tap what organized crime says. I am referring to section 178(1) of the existing law which refers to any other indictable offence in respect of which there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe that it forms a pattern of similar or related offences by two or more persons acting in concert and that such pattern is part of the activities of organized crime.

This parliament gave the minister full power against organized crime when it passed the previous legislation. The minister continues to raise the red herring that if these other offences are not included in the section, he will be terribly handicapped or inhibited. The law has always been there. The minister has to direct himself to the real questions: Have the law enforcement people been properly directed? Has the balance of the forces been correct? Have we had too many RCMP officers chasing around the campuses of Canada trying to track down some left-wing radicals, when they should have been out on the streets of Montreal and Vancouver working