

with respect to this legislation. This is a good example. Who has spoken? Who has given evidence? Who are the people who suggested it would not be a bad idea to have this agency under the umbrella of the RCMP? They are not a bunch of lunatics. They are not a bunch of people who do not have the national interest at heart. There is a wide ranging group of people.

Let me point out some of the people who made representations and who said that the RCMP should remain involved, who say that the Government is wrong in taking the action it is taking, who say that the Government is trying to repudiate the RCMP by this legislation by saying they are not competent or capable of carrying on the security service of our country. Who are these people who are castigating the Solicitor General, the chief henchman of John Turner, the next Prime Minister of this country? This man will ostensibly give advice, along with the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) who tippy-toed over to Mr. Turner during the course of last Saturday's proceedings. Who are these people who will advise Mr. Turner about the way in which our secret service will operate in Canada? I take it that it will be the Solicitor General. What has the Solicitor General failed to listen to? He failed to listen to people involved in the administration of justice in our country.

By way of example let me point out that the attorneys general of all the provincial governments have been united on one thing, the proposition that the agency should remain under the aegis of the RCMP. The attorneys general of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have sent telegrams to the Justice Committee making their position known. The Attorney General of the Province of British Columbia submitted a brief to the Justice Committee and appeared before that committee. Among other things he said this:

It seems to me to make a lot more sense to build on the institutional credibility that is already established, to use the umbrella of confidence that there is there, and to direct it and make it an effective security agency and make it an accountable one. I believe the Royal Canadian Mounted Police can be made an effective security force.

The Attorney General of Ontario, in a speech on February 7, 1984, had this to say:

But I find extremely unattractive and fundamentally unsustainable the assertion in this legislation that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police would exceed a statutorily defined mandate, evade the formal external review mechanisms, thwart ministerial accountability and abuse its defined statutory powers. The history and tradition of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police suggests very clearly to me that once there is an end to the absence of governmental direction and responsibility, which gave rise to the RCMP wrongdoing, the force will respond willingly and effectively to the wishes of the Canadian people as reflected in the new legislation.

The Attorney General of the Province of Saskatchewan submitted to the Justice committee an extensive brief dealing largely with the separation of the security service. He said as follows:

● (1930)

There is no indication, however, that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, as it is presently being managed by its senior officers, is not being responsive to the needs identified by Mackenzie and MacDonald for flexibility and change.

Security Intelligence Service

Who else has spoken in favour of the RCMP? Mr. John Russel, Executive Director of the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, has spoken in favour of the RCMP.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), posed a question to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) in committee. He asked the Solicitor General if he was satisfied with the operation by the RCMP of its security services. Do you know what the answer to that question was, Mr. Speaker? The Solicitor General himself said yes, that is so. He said that he was satisfied with the operation of the security service. Yet he has brought this legislation to the House in an attempt to protect the reputation, whatever it may be, of the Liberal Government and to protect the Government from the way in which it simply hung the RCMP out to dry at a time of crisis in the early 1970s without having any Ministers of the Liberal Government accept responsibility for the actions of the security service of Canada. Government Members are now attempting to create a civilian intelligence service.

I think the people of Canada are very interested in whether or not this is really the position taken by this Government under its new leader. They want to know whether or not Mr. Turner, his solicitor general and his minister of justice will continue this repudiation of the force which has the support and admiration of the overwhelming majority of Canadians. They want to know whether or not this force, which has brought such pride to Canadians over the years and which has played such a great part in the development of our country, and particularly in the development of western Canada, will be publicly repudiated by the Solicitor General who has said that this agency is not competent to carry on the security services of our country.

The attitude that is being taken by the Government is one which most Canadians will understand. It will be a factor when Canadians make up their minds whether or not they should support this Government at the time of the next election. I would like to explain why this is so. We are now seeing demonstrations of the arbitrary nature of the Government. Nothing has changed. The events of Saturday afternoon did not change a thing.

The Liberal leadership candidates spoke of parliamentary reform and how they will make Parliament more responsive. What is the first act of government Members when they return to the House of Commons? They invoke closure. We cannot even debate this matter to the extent it should be debated. We have before us a Bill that is limiting the civil liberties of Canadians and is putting Canadians in jeopardy because of the powers being given to this new agency.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what kind of mentality exists among Liberal Party members who preach rhetoric about a brand new tomorrow during the course of a leadership campaign? They have said: "A new Jerusalem is in sight. All we need to do is find someone to succeed our present Prime Minister and everything will change. We will have a new responsiveness, we will have more access to our leader, we will make sure that democracy works and we will not have the country run by an