

have a government which intends to bring in tax measures which would further aggravate the situation.

The point I am making is that we are creating a situation in which the removal of two-thirds of the farmers from the land will in fact will become a reality. We know many farmers have found themselves in the position of being in a cost-price squeeze. The cost of their input has increased since 1967 by roughly 8 per cent, while in the same period the price of the goods they sell has decreased by roughly 11 per cent. This type of situation cannot continue. It must be recognized that agriculture is indeed a risky business. The Minister of Finance and the parliamentary secretary—I do not believe he has a great deal of sympathy for the agricultural community—have not seen fit to incorporate any measures which would take cognizance of this fact.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

Progress reported.

[Translation]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

I would not want to be nasty to anybody, but I have not heard, because the sound system was not working, the progress report to the Chair, following the meeting of the committee of the whole.

Would it be possible for you to repeat the report which has just been brought forward?

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: To answer the hon. member, the report handed to me read as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the committee of the whole has considered a certain bill and has invited me to report progress and request leave to resume consideration at the next sitting of the House.

Such is the report handed to me.

Mr. Gilles Marceau (Lapointe): That was read in French by the Assistant Deputy Chairman of the committee of the whole.

(10:00 p.m.)

[English]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—USE OF INFORMERS—REPUDIATION OF STATEMENTS BY ROBERT EADIE AND FATHER

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be able to put our good friend the hon. member for New Westminster, now Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General, (Mr. Hogarth), through his baptismal fire.

In a speech to the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police on September 2, his boss the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) said that the work of the police calls for "a much

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

greater degree of open public discussion about police policy". As we know, the matter that brings us here tonight is the affairs of father Eadie and son Eadie—that is, the young fellow who was informer, and his father. I had asked a question about the activities of the younger Eadie and the statement to the House of the Solicitor General keeps us here tonight.

As former U.S. attorney general Ramsay Clark said—

No area of police activity calls for greater skill or discipline than drug control. Of all consensual crimes, the victim here is least reliable and least likely to co-operate. His dependence on his supplier is great. Most traffickers are users themselves and therefore doubly dangerous—dangerous as persons dealing in serious crime and dangerous as unstable individuals. Evidence is difficult to obtain in drug cases. Historically narcotics agents have worked under cover and through informers.

Mr. Clark, I imagine, is regarded by most of us, or at least those who have some knowledge of the law, as one of the great lawyers of our times. He went on to say:

Informers, rarely wholly reliable, are even more rarely so in narcotics cases.

Now we come to the case of the Eadies, and especially Eadie junior who appears to have earned his living from giving information to the police about drug users. His father has spoken on this matter. Whether the RCMP used intimidation to recruit his son, as he claims they did, by threatening to have him "busted" on planted evidence and sent back to the reformatory is one of the serious questions that has come out of this whole melancholy case.

Robert Wayne Eadie, on the CBC program of September 9, said his son had been paid \$305 by the RCMP over 2 ½ years dating back to when he was a youth of 18 for supplying information that had led to three arrests, that his son had been forced to supply information to the RCMP after they had been contacted by the Cornwall police who were holding him on a charge of drunkenness, and that his parents were never notified that he was being paid as an informer. He said that the RCMP coerced his son into providing information by threatening to plant drugs on him and prosecute him, and that his career as an informant ended after he was severely beaten by six guys and left for dead. He said his son lost his teeth because of this action.

The Solicitor General told us in the House that the practice of paying juveniles for information given by them to the police is repugnant. That this practice did not add appreciably to the efficiency of police operations I think almost anybody here could believe.

Before that, on August 15, the Solicitor General had told the Canadian public that the RCMP would not have a young person on the payroll as an informer. That leaves us in the position where we are very much in doubt about police operations. Perhaps we are left in doubt as to whether anybody should now be in jail because of information given to any court by a young person under oath. We are also left in some doubt as to the rapport between the Solicitor General and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

This is a subject totally repugnant to me, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, if I did not have the particular responsibility I would not be raising it this evening. I suppose, like most citizens, I would like to believe that