

am sure that all members of this House applaud those accomplishments. We only wish they were even more significant. I agree with the hon. gentlemen in those two portfolios that there is not a member of the House of Commons who does not wholeheartedly support the efforts of the RCMP. Indeed, I suspect there is not one of us who would not willingly support greater appropriations, budgetary and in every other way, to facilitate their efforts against organized crime.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacKay: We are not here to venerate nor denigrate the RCMP. We are here to improve the conditions under which they work. We would also like to make some constructive suggestions to the government to expedite their work.

The point made by the Minister of Justice that somehow we have a better record in Canada at the present time than the United States does not stand the test of logic. Certainly, anyone who has looked at any of the publications or programs lately realizes that organized crime has the same capacity as any multinational corporation. Meyer Lansky has just as much organizational ability as anybody who runs any multinational corporation in legitimate society. If the pickings in Canada are attractive, it will not take very long for organized crime to move their operations here, which according to the evidence we have seen lately is exactly what they are doing.

There is another problem. It has to do with the RCMP in the sense that if we are to expect the RCMP to fulfil their difficult and demanding role, we must take a look at the conditions under which they work and the attitude and relationship that exists between the RCMP and the Solicitor General to whom they report. I have been advocating, as have other hon. members, for a long time some needed changes to facilitate a better recourse to natural justice within the RCMP for members of the force. I see the previous solicitor general in the chamber at the present time. He made an effort to do that, but unfortunately during the time he was in the portfolio there were not many tangible results to change the poor treatment, in some cases, of RCMP officers which were brought to his attention. I wholeheartedly support the RCMP. Indeed, in many cases I have acted for individual officers. However, I was somewhat disturbed about the attitude exhibited by certain RCMP officers high up in the hierarchy toward the Solicitor General.

A most flagrant example to illustrate this, and which still causes me some concern for the relationship at times between the Solicitor General and the force for which he is responsible is contained in a report which I was able to get. I have a portion of it here. I have the whole document, if anybody wants to see it. A high ranking inspector, an officer in charge of the legal branch, said this about the then solicitor general:

It is not surprising either that there is at least the allegation, if not the fact, of influence peddling between the lawyer and the Solicitor General.

The background of this was simply that the solicitor general, to his credit, had been in touch with a lawyer in the Ogilvy Cope firm in Montreal named Arthur Campeau, who was trying to get a little bit of justice for some RCMP officers,

Organized Crime

Don McCleery and Gilles Brunet, who had been summarily discharged under section 173 without a smidgeon of a hearing. He was entering into some sort of dialogue with the lawyer to see what could be done to mitigate the circumstances if that were justified. It was absolutely unforgivable for a high-ranking RCMP officer to make that kind of allegation against the then solicitor general, under the circumstances. That is the type of thing that worries me about the relationship between the solicitor general and the force. It makes me think that the force should still be reporting to a more senior minister, the minister of justice, and it would resolve some of this bifurcated responsibility that exists between these two ministers vis-à-vis our national police force.

Another incident that shook my confidence about the type of information that we as members of the House of Commons get in these matters was the response I got to questions concerning information that I had elicited about the RCMP being in danger of being sued by a Montreal businessman as a result of some unfortunate things that the force had said about him. I raised this in the House of Commons and got very little response. I finally put it down for the adjournment debate. I then had the solicitor general's parliamentary secretary of the day, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin), practically tell me—and it is in *Hansard*—that I was crazy to suggest such a thing; that the RCMP would ever negotiate with anyone as to whether they would be sued or not.

I did not put it on the record. I can, because I have those documents as well. But I have a report signed by a former RCMP inspector saying precisely the opposite; that he went to that businessman's office, Mr. Bronfman, twice for the express purpose of negotiating with that man in order that he would not sue the force for defamation or libel. The information I got in the House of Commons about this matter was directly contrary to the facts, and misleading. I only mention it again to show that the information members of parliament get in this place from those on the other side is either the result of poor information gathered by the force—and I prefer to think that is the case—or reluctance to come clean by the government with their parliamentary colleagues. This is the type of thing that is worrisome. It affects the perception of both the force and the minister.

I raise that at this time in the context of this debate in the hope that some of these things will be looked into and studied. Most of all, I do it in the hope that the Solicitor General, who in my opinion is doing a good job and appears to be very cognizant about the need to do something about these conditions and to improve the communication and relationship between himself and the force, will look into some of these past injustices which he knows exist regarding McCleery, Brunet, Primeau, and others.

● (1740)

He has said he has already some indication that some of the recommendations of Judge Rene Marin are being brought in. I accept his word. I hope some day he will make the House aware of precisely what changes have been brought in as a