

(b) as brother and sister by consanguinity, whether by the whole blood or by the half-blood."

2. Strike out subclauses 3(2) and (3) and substitute the following:

"(2) A marriage between persons who are related in the manner described in paragraphs 2(2)(a) or (b) is void."—(*Honourable Senator Flynn, P.C.*).

Hon. Jacques Flynn: Honourable senators, I note that the motion to amend the report of the Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs on Bill S-2 has been pending since December 19, 1985.

I do not recall who telephoned me while I was away from the Senate, but I did indicate I had no objection to the question being put in the Senate. In fact, I thought somebody had done so.

In any event I have already explained why I introduced this amendment motion. I had reservations about adopting the committee report because it introduced new prohibitions.

In that respect I was supported by Senator Hicks and other senators.

Then I had an opportunity to discuss the matter with Senator Neiman and Senator Nurgitz, respectively Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, and, as I recall, with my friend Senator Stanbury. We raised the possibility of amending the report so that only marriages between father or mother and an adopted child would be prohibited.

At the time we all seemed to agree it was the only solution. I thought all senators would have time to read the amendment during the holidays and find out its full meaning. The debate on this matter has lasted long enough and I do not see any point in going over the same arguments. As far as I am concerned, the question can be put. If there are objections to my proposal, perhaps I will respond. However I had the impression that those who were interested in this matter agreed with the contents of the amendment I introduced on December 19 last.

● (1440)

[*English*]

Hon. Joan Neiman: Honourable senators, I am not sure whether it is in order for me to speak at this point, but I would be happy to have this matter resolved one way or another, because we have been considering it for some time.

I should like to adjourn the debate to enable me to consult with some of my colleagues in order that we might come to some agreement that would find favour with most honourable senators.

On motion of Senator Neiman, debate on motion in amendment adjourned.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Richard J. Doyle moved the second reading of Bill C-65, to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and other Acts in consequence thereof.

He said: Honourable senators, I should like to pose a question. What in the world was the world like in June 1974? Well, the big stories of the day had to do with \$1 million prizes for the Olympic Lottery, the negative Albertan response to federal support of western oil, and the curious case that the Micheners, and indeed the Queen, had watched television on stolen sets inside Rideau Hall.

"The Honeymooners" was showing on television, and Merv Griffin was also appearing. Over at the movie houses we were lining up for "Blazing Saddles," "The Exorcist," "The Great Gatsby," and "The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz."

In 1974 there were a lot of people who felt—who had good reason to feel—that the government's determination to establish new rules to deal with public complaints about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and internal complaints within the force, would be given a broader and more reasonable examination and prompt expression in legislation—that such justifiable consideration was just around the corner.

If you were aged 35 in 1974 and in the force, you would not be that far from retirement age before government good intentions seemed capable of realization. There is, of course, a good deal that could be said by way of explanation about why things went wrong—or, more explicitly, why things went nowhere.

To begin with, there was the Canadian tradition of appointing a commission of inquiry—in this case under Judge René Marin—to look into existing methods of handling complaints by the public against members of the RCMP. The commission was also asked to ascertain whether existing laws, policies, regulations, directives and procedures relating to discipline and grievance within the force were "susceptible to improvement." If they were "susceptible," how should the government respond to that susceptibility?

Honourable senators, bear in mind that Judge Marin undertook his onerous chores on the thirtieth anniversary of D-Day. By January 16, 1976, he was back with a sensible and sensitive report. The executive summary noted that the Marin commission's

recommendations are characterized by and synthesized under a remedial approach which would seek to ensure that the rights of citizens and members of the force are clearly recognized and respected.

In short, the judge understood his terms of reference and proceeded to deal with them—incidentally, proffering advice along the way on such related matters as native policing, remote postings, pensions, promotions and transfers.

Parliament got the word from Judge Marin on March 19, 1976. All members of the force received copies; internal committees at all levels in the force were established to provide