

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

our current and future needs. But citizen protest about noise and pollution resulted in reconsideration of the decision. In the process of reconsideration the rumour is that an expensive and careful report was prepared which was ready in September, 1970, one year ago, and which is still secret. This report is said to identify four sites in the Toronto area as being acceptable alternatives to Malton expansion, the choice depending on the relative weight given to environmental, social and financial criteria.

The Minister of Transport undertook to consult with Ontario, which was a good thing. But the effect of this consultation has been to implicate the Ontario government politically in the decision, for better or worse. The Ontario Conservatives have nothing to gain by publicizing a decision prior to the election—that is, the provincial election. Why should they rock the boat with a decision which, however defensible, is bound to be controversial? Presumably, if the Ontario Conservatives had felt strong enough politically to call their election months ago, the airport decision would already be announced.

But why should Toronto development suffer and remain uncertain because of local political considerations? I submit that the minister would accept the responsibility, which is his in the final analysis, to announce a decision and to defend it.

I sympathize with the difficulty the minister faces in making this important decision. But perhaps he should be reminded that sometimes decisions are hard to make because there is little ultimate difference among the alternatives. Shall I send her roses or carnations? If this is the minister's dilemma, perhaps he should flip a coin, but let him do it soon.

**Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the hon. member from Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) and I can appreciate fully the curiosity or perhaps the anxiety of those people who have a direct interest in the location of the new international airport for the city of Toronto and the surrounding area.

I wish to impress upon the House, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's reply during Wednesday's question period represents the latest information on this subject. Hon. members will recall that the minister referred to the meeting of July 26 with his counterpart the Minister of Transport for Ontario. I believe he was very encouraged by the progress achieved at that meeting and he is presently awaiting a response from the province of Ontario on the proposals. He has indicated that he would like to see that reply come as quickly as possible.

● (10:10 p.m.)

I noted a number of interesting points put forward by the hon. member. I will be pleased to bring these to the minister's attention.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—ROLE OF CIVILIAN SECURITY FORCE RESPECTING CHANGES

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are justifiably proud of the world's finest police force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Any-

[Mr. Kaplan.]

thing that touches upon that force or that seems to affect it in any way is a natural cause for alarm, hence my appearance this evening with the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) who will perhaps provide some of the basic answers to questions that are being asked by Canadians about the security planning and research group set up in the hon. gentleman's department in July, a group which was first brought to light in the CTV program "Question Period" approximately one month ago. Are we faced with "Goyer's gum shoes," as one question put it, or "Trudeau's non-police" or a Canadian version of the Central Intelligence Agency? Liberal MLA George Sprinkgate of the Quebec National Assembly was reported as saying in the *Globe and Mail* recently:

There is a damn distinct possibility increased government snooping will muzzle political opponents.

My colleague from Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) calls it the "super creeper" force. The *Globe and Mail* in its editorial says, "Shades of the Gestapo, NKVD and CIA". Somebody asked me what I was doing on the "late show" tonight, and my idea is that we might apply to the force the irreverent title of the Canadian OGPU.

No matter how we may feel about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Solicitor General seems to have some doubts about its operations, as he said when pressed to explain this new force within his department. He said:

I don't think the police are well prepared always to analyse the social context.

It is one thing to gather information. It is something else to analyse it.

When the report of the Royal Commission on Security came out, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made a statement about government policy pertaining thereto. He said then that the government would not follow the recommendations of that security commission. Now the Solicitor General has come along and thrown the Prime Minister's statement right out the window. In other words, he is refuting the assurances that the Prime Minister gave us when the royal commission report was tabled.

Douglas Fisher, a political opponent but a good, objective fellow in the press gallery, wrote in a column recently:

I understood that the new departmental group was to have a permanent advisory function but that its first assignment was to recommend changes in the composition and operations of the RCMP.

That will be one of two questions that I will ask the Solicitor General in a few minutes. It is interesting, Sir, to examine the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and to see what powers are possessed under it already. Under section 18(d) of the act we find that the force is "to perform such other duties and functions as are prescribed by the Governor in Council or the commissioner." If the minister wanted for some reason to change the course of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for example, he could make that recommendation directly to the Governor in Council.