

matter before the House. There was also an affidavit, I understand, filed by the then Minister of National Revenue, with questions also asked in the House. As far as the FLQ matter is concerned, I have, of course, filed affidavits under section 41(2), which I consider not only to be a power but really a duty on my part as custodian, in part, of files relating to national security of this country. This is a duty which has been imposed on me or given to me by parliament and I intend to exercise that duty.

DISCUSSIONS WITH PROVINCIAL ATTORNEYS GENERAL ON USE OF SECTION 41(2)—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question on the same topic for the Minister of Justice with whom I discussed this matter last March. At that time he indicated that he had had discussions 15 months before that with the provincial attorneys general about the use of section 41(2) of the Federal Court Act. Could the hon. gentleman bring the House and the country up to date on whether he has got anything new to report about the excessive use of this regressive section?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, my answers earlier indicated that what I had discussed with the provincial attorneys general was revisions of the Federal Court Act, not specifically the particular sections to which the hon. member is referring. Work is still proceeding on revision of the Federal Court Act, including section 28; when legislation might be introduced to this House I am unable to say.

Mr. MacKay: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the scathing comments that Chief Justice Deschenes of the Quebec Civil Court had to make about section 41(2), and in view of the fact that the minister has conceded that it is indeed part of the Federal Court Act, I would expect a more specific answer.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED BUGGING OF ALBERTA ATTORNEY GENERAL—
REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Solicitor General and concerns the Laycraft inquiry. In September of this year the attorney general of the province of Alberta indicated that he believed he had been bugged by the RCMP. That allegation has been known to the Solicitor General since September. Can he now advise the House whether that allegation is correct? If it is correct, can he advise the House whether that bugging was authorized under the wiretap law passed by this parliament in 1974?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I understand there was indeed such an allegation. The commanding officer of the force in Alberta met with the attorney

general of that province and I understand the attorney general of that province was entirely satisfied with the result of that meeting. There were no bugs involved and there was no surveillance by the RCMP of the attorney general of Alberta.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN FORCE AND NATIONAL REVENUE—
FAILURE TO NOTIFY ALBERTA ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In addition to the question of bugging, the attorney general of Alberta insisted that he was never advised of an agreement between the Department of National Revenue and the RCMP concerning the exchange of information between them with regard to the investigation of crime in the province of Alberta. Can the Solicitor General advise why the chief law enforcement officer of the province of Alberta was not advised of secret agreements between DNR and the RCMP on matters that concern his province?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, there was, of course, an agreement which was entered into in 1972 between the Department of National Revenue and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The object of that agreement was to increase the fight or to enhance the possibility of having greater success in the fight against organized crime in this country, an approach which had a great deal of success in the United States and we feel is most appropriate in this country also. Of course, the success of this agreement depended a great deal on the agreement not becoming generally known to the members of organized crime in this country. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of that agreement was to enhance the possibility of having greater success in the fight against organized crime in this country.

● (1442)

Mr. Leggatt: The Royal American shows have never been described as a part of organized crime at any time, at the time that that inquiry took place. Yet, that secret agreement was used to conduct an exchange of information. It is entirely possible that that exchange of information was illegal under the laws of Canada. My question is this: how does the Solicitor General justify the use of that secret agreement against an organization in which no one, as far as the Laycraft Commission has been able to determine, formed any part of organized crime?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, of course the hon. member is prejudging the results of the Laycraft inquiry. There is an inquiry ongoing in the province of Alberta at the moment on this matter. However, I should like to refer to one aspect of the case concerning the existence of that agreement between the Department of National Revenue and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. While it was not a widely known agreement, it was known to all people involved in the enforcement of it, both in the Department of National Revenue and in the RCMP.

An hon. Member: How about the Attorney General?