

The Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) has not addressed himself to the legislation. The only time we can get the Solicitor General on his feet is when he is clearing up some bureaucratic point. He has not stood in this House to justify why we need a civilian security force. He has not stood up in the House to indicate why more police powers are necessary. He has not indicated to the House whether there exists a real threat to Canada in terms of terrorists or subversives.

Mr. Kaplan: I did that at second reading.

Mr. de Jong: I do not see any government Members standing up to justify the legislation. Of course, the so-called justification was made in committee. I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. Kaplan: No, no. At second reading.

Mr. de Jong: I expect the Government to give the justification to the nation in Parliament, where the whole nation can watch on television—

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely the Hon. Member knows that the place for matters of principle is at second reading debate. Fifty-seven speeches were made on the subject which the Hon. Member is now urging us to speak on again—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. That is obviously an exchange in debate.

Mr. Kaplan: You were not here. That is the trouble.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I was here and I participated in that debate. Much of what I am saying now I said then, because there were not many government Members in the House to explain the legislation at that time. The Solicitor General is hauling in a red herring in an attempt to justify this legislation. That makes it even more obnoxious.

The Solicitor General has not stood to explain why he objected to the amendment my hon. colleague from Burnaby introduced. That amendment would ensure that the oath which is to be taken by the officers of the agency which is being established by this Bill, would be to carry out legal acts. The Solicitor General did not explain why he objected to having the word "legal" inserted in the oath. He has not given us the assurance that the agency will not become a bureaucratic monster which will swallow up the political masters. He has not given us any assurance that he and his colleagues are capable of holding in check the wide powers that this agency will have. He has not given the House any assurance that the Government is capable of controlling this agency. This Government has particularly proven how incapable it is of controlling other departments and other bureaucracies, bureaucracies which have swollen and swollen and swallowed Cabinet Ministers and the political masters of those departments.

After seeing the lack of performance in this House and the lack of justification by Members opposite I am more afraid than ever before. I do not think the Government is capable.

Security Intelligence Service

Personally I think Members opposite are honest, decent people who do not wish other people harm. However, I have very little confidence in their ability to administrate, to be on top of and in control of government. I have very little confidence in their ability to control the agency which the Government is creating. I am afraid that a monster is being created which, at some future date, government Members will regret. Unfortunately, it might then be too late.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with Clause 3 which is dealt with in the five or six motions that have been grouped for debate. In response to the last speaker, who was lamenting that government Members have not been speaking, to which the Minister replied that it was dealt with at second reading and that the amendment should have been made at second reading—

Mr. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): He did not say that at all.

Mr. Kaplan: After 57 speeches.

Mr. Thacker: The problem was that debate was closed off at second reading and we were not able to introduce some of the amendments. When the amendments were proposed at committee stage they were dealt with and considered by the committee. Amendments were proposed at that time which were subsequently returned to the House and ruled out of order. The point I would like to make is that whenever Liberal Members take a fresh look at a problem, with people grouped around, they find the amendments to be totally satisfactory. Indeed, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand), formerly the Solicitor General during the period in which the RCMP allegedly got out of control, put amendments which the Cabinet rejected. That is the irony. A former Solicitor General with all his years of firsthand experience had his amendment rejected. Therefore, the Minister, with great respect, does not make sense in his objection.

As well during the committee stage, on one occasion independent government Members, the Hon. Member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) and the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey), when they looked at the amendments fresh without having received instructions from the Minister or the Cabinet, abstained from voting, and in some cases when there was a tie vote the chairman had to step in and save the Government. Indeed, even the chairman on one occasion voted with the Opposition. Now the Government is saying it will put in a fresh motion which will overturn the majority decision of the committee. If we could deal with Government back-benchers on a person-to-person basis, we could convince them on hard evidence. The committee did hear the witnesses. I am sure those Members would recognize that Bill C-157, which was the predecessor to Bill C-9, was worded so badly that in order to get itself off the hook, the Government sent it to a Senate committee. The Senate committee heard witnesses and made over 40 amendments to the Bill before it was returned to the House.

Clause 3 is actually the establishment of the service. Without saying it in so many words, it in effect creates a civilian