

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I gather from you that that was not a valid question of privilege, so who is abusing the rules of the House? It is the Member opposite, trying to make a question of privilege out of a statement that is not.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Kaplan: Now we have a point of order. I think I should be allowed to speak.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) allow me one comment? I invite Hon. Members—and this is somewhat at the discretion of the Chair—to stick as much as possible to the contents of the motions now before the House. The Chair has listened to Members on both sides of the House with some leniency. Hon. Members have been allowed to digress from time to time to make personal points. But at this time we ought to strive once again to make every effort to debate the motions now before the House. I will be glad to enumerate them for Hon. Members once again. Having said that, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Skeena on a point of order.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear that I did not rise on a question of privilege but on a point of order. It demonstrates once again that the Solicitor General does not listen to what goes on in the House of Commons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is quite right. The Chair had recognized the Hon. Member for Skeena on a point of order. At this time I invite the Solicitor General to continue his remarks on the motions before the House.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I gather it was not a valid point of order either. The Member opposite did accuse me of treason. He did say that we should be kicked out of the country. He can check the record on that. He did put on the record how many generations he and his ancestors have spent in this country defending our liberties, for which I am very grateful. This is a great country. I only want to say, perhaps for those in the Gallery who think the Government has been reticent to listen to reason on this Bill, that there has been a great deal of process associated with this Bill already. Notwithstanding what the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) said, the Government has accepted over 5 major amendments since the—

Mr. Fraser: Not on this Bill.

● (1320)

Mr. Kaplan: May I finish? It has accepted that number of amendments since the introduction of Bill C-157, which was the Government's initial response.

Mr. Fraser: That was not in the House of Commons.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is my understanding that at this point in the debate we are dealing with a number of motions that refer to Clauses 12, 13, 15 and 16. Not a single member on the government

Security Intelligence Service

side stood to support those clauses. On a number of occasions, the Speaker has called Members on this side of the House to order because they did not deal with the motion before the House. It is about time that the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) finally did so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would invite the Hon. Member not to reflect on the Chair's comportment in this debate.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Apply the same standards to them as you apply to us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) should listen for a moment. I sat down just a moment ago and I did request of the Hon. Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Kaplan) that he confine his remarks to the motions now before the House. I will invite him to do so again, and I rise as often as is necessary, as I have been doing to invite all Hon. Members on either side of the House to do just that.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I will just wrap things up. I gather that I have hit a sensitive nerve opposite. I do not wish to delay debate. In fact, I will simply indicate that all of the reasons for which Members on this side of the House support the clauses of the Bill have been explained at very great length in committee and on second reading. Those reasons have been explained by me in speeches that I have made across the country and in interviews that I have given to journalists.

We do not want to see this debate prolonged unduly and repetitively. That is the reason why we are not standing up. It is not because we are arrogant or because we feel that there are no good answers; it is because we recognize that we have been elected to act and action in the legislature produces legislation. We would like to see this legislation, which has been very much improved by public debate, by discussions and by amendments, moved forward and become law. That is why we are not standing up. All of the other improper imputations that have been hurled across the floor to explain our failure to rise are just baloney.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed by the remarks that were just made by the Minister. It was just yesterday that the Minister and his Government moved closure.

Mr. Kaplan: Order. What has that got to do with the debate?

Mr. Orlikow: The Minister knows that the debate on this Bill will end on Thursday evening. Members on this side of the House who disagree with the Government cannot hold the Bill up. We cannot filibuster the Bill.

If he had the courage, which he does not, the Minister could rise in his place and explain his reasons for the legislation that he is proposing. The Minister does not rise, not because he does not want to prolong the debate. He knows that the debate will end. The Minister does not rise because he knows that the