

Security Intelligence Service

most obvious reason would somehow be that it lulls the public into believing that it is having some participation in the Parliamentary preparation of a Bill, such as the security bill or the peace institute bill.

It is rather sad that a committee system within the House of Commons with representation of all parties, and to which Canadians look for a degree of wisdom and integrity, can be misappropriated to give a sense that something decent is being done when in fact there is no decency there. These thoughts were raised when the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills spoke.

I would rather think a Government that provides for committee hearings would also be prepared when it asks the public for submissions to listen to what the public is saying. There is a great deal of wisdom out beyond these walls. That may not appear to be the case to members of the Government, but that is a fact. I believe the least we can do if we are going to honour this institution, and if we are going to ask the citizens of Canada to respect the institution of Parliament, is to pay them the honour of listening to them when they speak.

The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) spoke of his experience in the Soviet Union a little over a year or two. Certainly he brought back some rather stark memories of my visit to the Soviet Union with others from this House in January and February. I think it is imperative that we ensure that our Canadian justice system and our Canadian security system does not fall prey to the type of misuse and abuse we see in totalitarian countries such as the Soviet Union. Citizens simply minding their own business or acting within the confines of the constitution of their country and breaking no laws can be the subject of heavy handed surveillance and heavy misuse of justice.

I believe it is almost imperative that security be left in the hands of the RCMP. If it is in hands in which Canadians do not have trust then its job is ten times, or many times more difficult. In fact, it may be impossible. We propose this be left in the hands of the RCMP. I know as I speak for constituents of Okanagan-Similkameen that I am expressing their wishes. If they had been available and free to appear before the standing committee hearings they would have stated that position.

I hope government Members will reconsider some of the positions they have taken, study the evidence before them, study the sentiments and opinions of the common people and the experts and change the legislation to conform more adequately to that which is required and desired by the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with this section of the Bill from a democratic point of view. In democracies Governments are elected to represent the thinking of the people. That is the way it was in the early days. At first everybody went to Parliament. As the population increased, this was impossible so representatives were sent. Representatives were supposed to represent the majority thinking of the people. But with this Government, we are getting

further and further away from that concept and closer and closer to a totalitarian concept where the Government thinks it has access to all wisdom, and the Government tells the people what is good for them. I find that in this Bill, and it is wrong in a democracy. Canadians are getting sick and tired of being told what is good for them, instead of the Government trying to find ways and means of doing what the majority of the people want.

I do not think there is any doubt the RCMP has been doing a good job. If the RCMP is incompetent and is unable to do the job, that is one thing, but when we come to actual evidence we find the very opposite. I want to put on the record some of the evidence from the Committee. This is a question and answer portion involving the critic for our Party, the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), and the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan). The Hon. Member for Vancouver South, our critic, wanted to find out whether the RCMP was competent and whether it was doing the job well. Here are some of the questions and answers which I think the public is entitled to know about:

MR. FRASER: And the commissioner has remained responsible for the security service all during these tumultuous years.

MR. KAPLAN: Yes, he has.

He is referring to the years since 1978 and 1979. The Commissioner has been doing his job.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Members of the Conservative Party have read that question and answer into the record at least eight times today. Is there some rule against such a tremendous amount of needless repetition?

Mr. McCain: Change the Bill.

● (2040)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please. The difficulty in this debate, at least in terms of the last two speakers which the Chair has heard, is that they have not been relevant to the clauses we are discussing. The rules are fairly straightforward with regard to debate at report stage. It has to be relevant. It cannot be a general debate on the principle of the Bill. I wonder if the Hon. Member who has the floor is able to tell us what clauses we are on.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The point raised by the Hon. Solicitor General is hardly a point of order. Perhaps they should listen to these points; they still have not got home. The situation is the same as it was the other day when I said what we need is a carrier pigeon which has been crossed with a woodpecker, so that it will not only take the message over there but it will pound it into their heads. That is not happening. Surely democracy is not contrary to these clauses of the Bill we are discussing. Surely it is not. Now the Hon. Solicitor General wants to tell us what to say and how many times we can say it. That is just what I am trying to prove, that the Government is trying to tell people what is good for them. I do not want the Solicitor General to make my speeches for me. I will make my own. The people of Canada do not want the