

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

everything was working for the best of all possible worlds. However, because of the rather substantial differences between people in different positions I feel it my duty and obligation to raise the matter tonight. I hope my hon. friend, who has had a great career in the courts—much more than I have had—in dealing with this type of matter and dealing with crime, will be able to support some of the points I have raised.

**Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this question which has been raised by the hon. member, and which is indeed a very serious subject, the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) has very little to add to what was said in his statement on motions on September 17 last as reported in *Hansard* at page 7937. This dealt both with the policy of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with respect to the employment of informers of a young age and with the Eadie case.

Specifically, five allegations were made by young Eadie. First, that he was forced to supply the RCMP with information relating to drug offences under threat of returning to prison. This was refuted, as reported in *Hansard* at page 7938. Second, Mr. Eadie alleged that his parents were not aware of his activities. This was refuted at the same page. Third was the allegation that there was a threat to plant drugs upon him if he did not provide the police with information. This was refuted. Fourth, he alleged that he gave information which resulted in three arrests. This was not necessarily refuted; the RCMP reported that he gave information on 21 occasions which resulted in successful police action in respect of 14. Fifth, he alleged that he was threatened with physical harm because he was a police informer, or at least that it was found out, and that the police refused him protection. This was categorically denied.

In respect of the statement on motions made by the Solicitor General, I think it is to be noted that the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) made specific mention of the fact that it is sometimes inadvisable to rely on statements made by paid informers. Indeed, as my hon. friend knows, the rules of evidence are such that this type of evidence must be corroborated in any court of law.

In any event, on September 30, the young man went on television again. It was this second appearance that gave rise to these proceedings tonight. At that time it did not appear to the Solicitor General that he said much that he had not alleged before, and there was very little that could be added. In that broadcast it was alleged that the Solicitor General was wrong with respect to the fact that Eadie's parents were informed. The Solicitor General has reviewed the file and contacted the Royal Canadian Mounted Police again on this point. It is suggested that there is a difference in fact here, and the Solicitor General relies on the previous statement that he made.

The second allegation made in the new broadcast, that he was forced to inform about drugs under threat by the RCMP, is also denied, as it was before. The third allegation is that he was beaten up because he was a drug informant and that he asked for protection. Similarly, there is nothing to add to what was said before. The fourth allegation was, and this was somewhat new in that broadcast—

[Mr. McCleave.]

(10:10 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Hogarth:** Mr. Speaker, might I have half a minute to finish?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Hogarth:** The fourth allegation is that he was contacted by the RCMP in November, 1968, that he provided information one week later and that he received payment for this information during Christmas of 1968. This is denied by the RCMP. The records indicate that the first payment to him was made on April 30, 1969. I regret that is all the information we have to provide. There has been a thorough looking into of the case on behalf of the RCMP.

TAXATION—SUCCESSION DUTIES AND GIFT TAXES—  
PROPOSED FEDERAL ABANDONMENT—REPLY TO  
PROVINCIAL REQUESTS FOR DELAY

**Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, on October 8, as reported at page 8554 of *Hansard*, I directed the following question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau):

I understand the Prime Minister has now sent a reply to the previous letter of August 6 requesting a one-year delay in the implementation of the proposals regarding changes in succession duties and gift taxes. I wonder whether the Prime Minister is now in a position to inform the House of the nature of his reply?

The Prime Minister said in reply:

—I indicated that my reply was to the effect that we were not going to delay the implementation of the government's decision, subject to our getting the legislation through the House, of course. I added that federal officials and ministers would be prepared to discuss with provinces that desire to have discussion ways in which we might assist them in preparing to raise their own taxes if they wanted to step in where the federal government had stepped out. As the House knows, the announcement was to the effect that we would not continue collecting these taxes but that if the provinces wanted to start collecting them we would try to assist them to do so.

In a word, Mr. Speaker, that reply is completely unreasonable. If the provinces are to collect estate and gift taxes, they must first pass legislation. They do not know at this moment when the tax bill before this House will pass, so they cannot very well begin the procedures necessary for the passage of the legislation. There is no time available to them to consult with other provinces in an attempt to establish the sort of uniformity necessary in estate and gift tax legislation, if they are to be administered by the provinces. There is no time available for them, after the bill before this House passes, for the framing of their own legislation. There is no time available for them to call special sessions of their own legislatures in order that their legislation may come into effect on January 1, 1972.

Their request was entirely reasonable and I fail to understand why the government has not acceded to it. In view of the problems the provinces would face in attempting to get all these tasks completed by January 1, 1971, the Prime Minister's offer of assistance is nothing more than hot air.