

*Government Organization*

second reading, my amendment bears no relation whatever to the personalities of the present Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General.

The point I made before—and I make it again only in case some hon. members were not in the house last night when I dealt with this matter—is that in this era of organized crime, of complicated relationships across provincial and international boundaries, the person who deals with the only police force available in the federal sphere, the force that is responsible for security, should be the first law officer of the crown, namely, the Minister of Justice. To separate the function of controlling, training and dealing with the force from the function of dealing with all these other jurisdictions in the field of the enforcement of law may in the long run lead to conflict between these two departments, to the lack of proper liaison between the police force available, the only federal police force there is, and the administration of the law. In my submission it would be a very grave error, and for that reason I move, seconded by—I am told I do not need a seconder:

● (4:40 p.m.)

That section 4 be amended by striking out subparagraph (c) thereof.

**Mr. Scott (Danforth):** Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment and to ask members of the committee to take a serious look at it instead of just shouting for this thing to be rammed through by calling for the question to be put before somebody in the government ranks gets up and tells us the reason for this transfer. We have really heard nothing to justify it. Members on this side of the house have tried, apparently unsuccessfully, to point out the dangers inherent, in our view, in this transfer of jurisdiction. I would have hoped that the Minister of Justice would give us the benefit of his views and experience in so far as the proposal the government is now making is concerned. We would have had an opportunity then to hear the reasons behind the proposed transfer of the police. Such reasons might be very intriguing if they were laid before the committee.

My colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood, has outlined briefly the qualms that we feel at what is taking place here. He has tried to emphasize the tremendous need not for decentralization of the police force but for greater and greater co-ordination. I can recall that in 1962 the hon. member for Greenwood and I appeared as counsel for our

[Mr. Brewin.]

party before the Ontario royal commission on organized crime. At the outset we thought the commission was embarking on a two-week investigation. However, the more we went into the problems of syndicated crime, international crime, and the extent of its infiltration into Canada, the longer the commission sat and the greater the lessons we learned as a result.

We had the advantage of hearing from Mr. Robert Kennedy, then Attorney General of the United States. He did not appear in person but submitted a very powerful and forceful brief in which he outlined the great problems that had developed in the United States of America in attempting to deal with various types of organized and syndicated crime. The major lesson that ran through this presentation was the danger inherent in an inefficient police administration, the very condition which the government intends to create here.

He pointed out the difficulties in the United States where an entire city apparatus was corrupted by the forces of organized crime. He pointed out that once organized crime gets a toehold it is virtually impossible to wipe it out. Every possible degree of co-ordination is required between our police forces and yet here we seem to be moving in exactly the opposite direction. The other lesson we learned from the royal commission in Ontario was that within Ontario itself one of the big problems in dealing with crime was the lack of co-ordination between police forces in our small towns and cities. This condition extends right across the country.

All of us remember the criticism, perhaps some of it unfair, to which the R.C.M.P. were subjected at the time of the famous Rivard case. Again, this case showed lack of communication, lack of co-ordination and the need to strengthen substantially this type of liaison between the police. However, it seems to us that the government is proposing a fantastic idea in that the Minister of Justice, who is charged with the carrying out of our laws and the preservation of justice throughout the country, is going to be divorced from the training, administration and functioning of the mounted police. How are they going to work together? Are they going to write each other letters, and that sort of thing? How is co-ordination going to take place at a time when all of us are aware that the forces of crime are attempting to extend their influence into Canada? No one is assessing blame for this, but the fact is still undeniable that this is