

course, the Constitution Act of 1982. That Act implemented fundamental changes in our country, the effects of which will be felt, generations and generations. Bill C-9 does exactly the same thing. It is creating a change to our culture.

I speak as a westerner, and westerners have a very deep attachment to the RCMP. That is true not only of westerners. In my travels through Ontario and the Atlantic provinces, I found that the people there also have a very deep attachment to the RCMP. The force has a long tradition of stability, of discipline and of fraternity and loyalty to the country. The big danger that many people fear is that a new civilian agency may not be able to achieve those qualities. That is a very honest and legitimate point about which people are concerned and that is what we should be debating. However, the tactics of members of the NDP end up blocking that proper debate and consideration of the Bill by the citizens.

Let us not forget that at second reading of this Bill it should have been appropriate for Opposition Parties to put in amendments so that some of these grand issues could have been discussed. That was not done because the Government moved closure. We have not had the opportunity to let the citizens witness a full discussion of this matter. The same was true in committee as well. We were faced with closure and attempts to block us off.

At the committee stage of this Bill in which several Members participated, we heard from some 24 or 25 witnesses. Over 50 briefs were presented to us and were read and considered. We sat day after day. We had long debates on these clauses. It became clear to us that there is no broad consensus across this country as to whether this Bill is totally good or whether it is totally bad. The witnesses raised some very honest and legitimate points to which they recommended changes. We put those changes forward and the Government rejected them.

Surely committee stage exists so that a small group of Members of Parliament may hear witnesses give hard evidence and come up with changes that reflect that evidence. The amendments put forward by the Progressive Conservative Party reflect the hard evidence given by well meaning, educated, intelligent Canadians who gave us the benefit of their views. On one occasion, even Government Members accepted one such amendment after having heard the evidence.

Government Members accepted the amendment which proposed that the review committee would have access to Cabinet documents. The amendment was accepted at committee but we find that the Cabinet will not accept what the citizens want and is not prepared to accept the wisdom of a committee on which a majority of Government Members sat. Those Government Members indicated that the review committee should have access to Cabinet documents. Never having heard any of the witnesses, the Cabinet will not accept that and will force an amendment through at report stage that will delete that important change that was brought about as a result of hearing the evidence. Why do we have a committee stage, Mr. Speaker, if Cabinet members are not prepared to accept the

evidence that is brought forward and the changes that are recommended?

My colleague has described our amendments to the House. Our first amendment would have the effect of leaving the security service with the RCMP. That is a very legitimate amendment. We looked at the Mackenzie report in some detail. The Mackenzie report of 1969 recommended the creation of a civilian security agency because it felt that the RCMP would not be able to adapt to the modern technologies required to become an intelligence service. In actual fact, since 1969 the RCMP has become a very sophisticated agency. In terms of intelligence, it has done a very excellent job for this country by intercepting KGB agents. As well, when looking at its commercial crime operation, its handling of drug cases and its handling of the Mafia, one sees that the RCMP is capable of being just as sophisticated as any civilian agency could ever be. Therefore, the report of the Mackenzie Commission falls. It carries no weight or evidence and would be rejected in a court of law because the subsequent history of the RCMP has discounted it.

The same is true of the McDonald Commission. All of its reasons for taking the security service away from the RCMP fall under the weight of the hard evidence that we heard from the people. The last reason the McDonald Commission gave for separating the agencies was that it would enhance the image of the RCMP if it was not involved in security. That is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Members of the RCMP were not the ones who were to blame for the incidents surrounding the 1970 FLQ crisis. They received instructions from the highest office of the land to find out what was going on. It is true that they burned barns and that was wrong. It is true that they broke into offices and opened mail and that was wrong. However, they were doing those things on the instructions of the highest political office of this land. Where were the politicians when the situation blew up? They were running and hiding behind fences and barns themselves. They were not prepared to take the heat.

**Mr. Kaplan:** There were no such instructions.

**Mr. Thacker:** There sure were. Canadians do not believe for a moment that the RCMP was doing that on its own. Yet it was left out to hang on the clothes line and it took all the heat. We do not accept that. The amendments that we have put forward would provide a proper chain of accountability so that the RCMP and the security agency would follow the political masters and the political masters would take the heat if something was done wrong. It is a fraud and a cover-up of which I will not be a part.

● (1230)

Other amendments which were put forward by our Party dealt with domestic subversion. In particular, under the new definition in Clause 2(d), the description of domestic subversion is cast so widely that it can honestly and truly be abused. If one sits down with ordinary citizens at their kitchen table and asks them what they think a security service should be