

RCMP Informants

from April 30, 1969, until February 18, 1971; that the information Mr. Eadie provided contributed to 14 successful police actions.

Fifth allegation: Mr. Eadie, Jr. said his use as an informant "ended pretty well after my beating, when I got beat up because I was too scared to even leave the house for about six months, because they would not give me protection or anything so, I pack it in." Mr. Eadie, Jr. also said that he asked for police protection from "the RCMP and they laughed it off" and he implied that as a result of the beating he had lost his teeth.

The facts are that on the day of the alleged beating of Mr. Eadie, Jr. on June 8, 1969, the RCMP detachment commander at Long Sault accompanied by a member of the Cornwall city police were called to the Eadie home; that Mr. Eadie, Jr. and both his parents were present; that it was observed that Mr. Eadie, Jr. had a small cut on his upper lip for which he refused medical attention; that there was no apparent damage to his teeth; that a member of the Cornwall city police was present in case assault charges were to be laid by the Eadie family; and that the family refused to press charges. Hon. members should note that after the alleged beating on June 8, 1969, Mr. Eadie, Jr. supplied information on 14 different occasions until July, 1971—a period of over two years after the alleged beating. It should also be noted that Mr. Eadie, Jr. was seen by members of the RCMP detachment at Long Sault about one week after the alleged beating in the downtown section of Cornwall and he did not try to conceal his presence. At no time did Mr. Eadie, Jr. ever ask for police protection from a member of the RCMP.

[*Translation*]

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to the House that I am satisfied that the investigation conducted by the Commissioner of the RCMP into the very serious allegations made by Mr. Robert W. Eadie Jr. was thorough, competent and conclusive. I can assure the House that the allegations of impropriety and misconduct which were made about officers of the RCMP in connection with the case are untrue and malicious.

[*English*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the minister, who has read a lengthy statement on an important subject, would have made sure that hon. members on this side of the House were provided with copies of the statement prior to its being read in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: The minister's failure to do so is an abuse of privilege.

Mr. Woolliams: I say that particularly because the statement was so important. In dealing with an important matter such as the administration of the law, may I say at the outset that the carrying out of the law is very important, and the good name of Canada has been somewhat connected with the good name of the RCMP. I am happy that the minister has had the matter investigated, but it may be that there should have been a more independent investigation.

I want to refer to one aspect that I think is most serious. In this technological age, in this age of electronics, police forces such as the RCMP or those operating in urban centres do not need to hire stool pigeons. Whether a person is 17, 18 or 19 years of age is mere quibbling. The fact is that if people are used and paid to give information, they are not really volunteering information. The element of materialism is being used to acquire information by the payment of money. From personal experience in acting as defence counsel on certain drug cases I know that stoolpigeons have been used by the police not only in urban centres but by the RCMP elsewhere. In this technological age the police have other methods of investigation without having to use the human elements of stoolpigeons and paying for information. I am always a little suspicious about the kind of information and evidence obtained from a man who has had his palm crossed with dollars.

The weakness in the minister's statement, if I might put my finger on it, is that he says the RCMP are no longer going to use juveniles but instead use the age under the new offenders act—I could say something about that, but I do not want to digress—and that even though they are not going to use persons 17 or 18 years of age it is all right to use persons beyond that age. In this technological and electronic age it is not necessary to use that kind of method to feed the police information when carrying on an investigation. I think that is where most of the trouble arises.

This investigation was carried out by the distinguished commissioner of the RCMP, a man of great integrity, but I hope the minister will not now oppose, as he has previously, this matter going before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs so that the report prepared by the minister's officials and read by him, the report on the investigation made by the commissioner of the RCMP could be examined and proper questions put by members of that committee to avoid any suspicion that there might be any prejudice or that there might have been a white-wash. In other words, it would be in the interests of the integrity that hon. members believe the RCMP have. If the report is honest and straightforward and if the investigation has been thorough as the minister would have us believe, then, although he always has refused, he should be prepared to allow the commissioner or anyone else who had anything to do with the investigation to come forward and give evidence at the committee level. If Mr. Eadie wishes he could also come forward and tell his side of the story so that the whole matter would be before us and we would not have any more problems. We must always guard against overzealousness in police work but we must also see that the law of the land is carried out. If it is flaunted, how can the citizens of Canada have any respect for the law?

I am not going to say any more because this is not the time to be talking in a political vein. The matter is too important and too close to all members of the House, no matter where they sit. I hope that the next time the minister has such a lengthy report on such a serious matter we can be provided with advance copies so that we can analyse it and reply to it intelligently.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!