

performing a useful function or that it is free from the possibility of political subversion. In any nation which has set up a civilian police force of this nature, checks and balances are written into the system which is given birth legitimately by legislation. Here we have an organization set up by executive order that takes its instructions from time to time. Even if the possibility exists that the purposes of the group could be subverted for political purposes, the danger should be met by either voting the force out of existence or legitimizing it by legislation.

This party believes that a bill should be brought before parliament to legitimize PSPG in the same way that the CIA is set up in the United States. The president of the Treasury Board shakes his head, meaning that this is not so; but my information, and I believe it is accurate, is that there is legislation supporting the setting up of the CIA, legislation passed by the legislature in the U.S. The same thing exists with respect to the SIS in Great Britain and with respect to the Gehlen organization in Germany. I am not certain, but I believe the same legislative foundation to a security force exists in the Deuxième Bureau in France.

[Translation]

Mr. Goyer: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. Minister of Supply and Services on a question of privilege.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers constantly in his remarks to agencies which carry out police-type duties. I find that comparison odious. The hon. member is well aware that this agency does not conduct any police operations. Moreover, the planning, research and analysis group was set up in full agreement with the group—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I am sorry, but I must interrupt the hon. minister. The point he is raising is surely a subject of debate. If he has a question to raise concerning House procedure, he has not yet brought it to the attention of the chair. The hon. member does have a right to his opinions, as does the hon. minister, and I think that at this time, we should, if possible, avoid interrupting hon. members, in view of how little time remains before the House votes. The hon. member for Yukon has the floor.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I simply wish to say that when the hon. member quotes examples chosen outside Canada, he tends to lead the House to false conclusions, since the example he gives is completely contrary to the facts—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member has no wish to doubt the truth of the hon. minister's remarks and opinions, but the point he is raising is, nevertheless, a subject for debate, at this juncture I do not consider it acceptable.

The hon. member for Yukon has the floor.

Estimates

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the minister is still keeping in very close touch with the force which he originated himself and which still bears the imprint of his name.

Mr. Paproski: "Goyer's gumboots".

Mr. Nielsen: The fact is that both he and his successor have said very often that the force is operational in the sense that it can pick up the telephone and report to the RCMP that such and such an individual or circumstance in this country should be made the subject of an investigation. It has happened, and when that can happen it is a danger.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: If that can happen, legislation should be brought before the House and passed to legitimize that group, and into that legislation should be written checks and balances which will assure us that the force cannot possibly be subverted for political purposes. An argument can be made for such an organization, and this might be the nucleus of it—but not in this way. In other countries, of which apparently the minister has no knowledge as was obvious from his interjection, there is for instance in the West German organization and the English organization a requirement that the force report as frequently and as fully to the opposition as it does to the government. That information is subject to the oath of a privy councillor that is taken by the leader of the opposition. That is the kind of check and balance of which I am speaking.

There may well be this evening a vote on the item dealing with the Pickering airport. I just want to forewarn the House that this may occur. Should this party take this stand and vote against the whole of the estimate, it does so because the government has put us in the position where we have no alternative but to vote in this fashion in order to register the opposition which we have to the money which is set aside for the Pickering airport. That vote contains moneys for the Montreal airport and two others. The fact that the government has placed us in this position compels us, should we decide to vote against that particular item, to vote against the whole of it with the urgent suggestion to the government that it bring in immediately a supplementary estimate, should the vote against the motion succeed, in order to provide the sums that would be necessary for the continuing operation of Montreal and the other two airports. This can be done, and the government would have our assurance that it would get immediate assent, as rapidly as it wanted, to bring this about.

● (2140)

Now, Sir, we are pretty well finished with the last phase of the business of supply. We are in the last allotted day for the period ending June 30 and the notices of opposition have been filed. I now intend to raise two points of order that must be raised before the motions can be dealt with. The first point of order that I raise is with respect to the questions on the motions set out as No. 7 and No. 9 on the order paper. Motion No. 7 seeks the concurrence of the House in vote L30 of the Department of Transport for "Air transport program—advances for operating and capital