to get involved in civil disobedience as a form of protest against injustices, we know that their activities will be documented.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but her time has expired.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if you could report to the House whether or not your investigation concerning the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has been completed and whether or not the transcripts are available to Members of the House. I was not a member of the committee, and in preparing my notes and thoughts for the debate, the transcripts would certainly be helpful to me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. Order. The Chair has taken the necessary steps to verify the question. The initial indications may be that the material is available. We must wait a few more minutes for verification before I can make a ruling on that point of order.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Two members of the New Democratic Party have now been heard. We would certainly welcome the participation of members of the Conservative Party in this debate if they wish to rise at this point.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The Chair has already indicated that it is entirely up to the individual Members to decide whether or not they wish to speak. Is there anyone else who wishes to participate in the debate?

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, if the Tories are really serious about their opposition to this Bill, I think that they should be making the public aware of their position. I am the third member of the New Democratic Party in a row who has risen to make a speech. Although we welcome the opportunity to get our point across, we would like to make this a serious debate by having someone from the Government and someone from the Opposition make their views on this Bill known.

The foundation of the Canadian judicial system is the rule of law. The bottom line of this system is that the law must apply to all Canadians, whether or not they are members of a security service. I consider myself to be a layman in the area addressed by this particular piece of legislation, so my point of view is really the point of view of a layman. Perhaps that view from the street is the approach we need to take when dealing with this particular legislation.

The first concern of most citizens is that we protect ourselves from an insurrection. When hearing of insurrections in other parts of the world, many of us have said that such a thing could not happen in Canada. I spent a number of years living in an African country that had been through a civil war and a couple of coups. I must say that the people who lived in that country had the tendency to say: "It cannot happen here". But it did happen there and it can happen here. In fact, it happened in that particular country more than once. The country to which I just referred considered itself to be a democracy. Democracy can be undermined by the very institutions which are intended to protect it. Therefore, it becomes exceedingly important that we as parliamentarians control the forces that are necessary to protect our democracy. If we do not make the kind of laws that will protect our democracy, not only from without but from within, we will be entering into an unacceptable situation. We must carefully structure the security service of which we are speaking today in such a way that it will protect us not only from insurrection from outside the country but also from the kind of tyranny which is possible from within the country.

I do not think anyone disputes the need to be watchful. However, we must be sure that the structure we put in place does not itself create the circumstances under which there may be a possible insurgence. Over thousands of years, history has told us that there is such a danger. For instance, I wonder if the German SS did not begin as a secret service which was considered necessary and in fact good. I know that people say that Germany was a fascist country at the time but it did not start out that way. In 1933, Hitler was elected and later became a dictator. Germany was a democracy in 1933.

Power can very easily be institutionalized. The secret service or the security force can become a tyrant that thinks what it does is right and thinks that it has the power to do whatever it wishes. Back a few years ago, we were worried about the involvement of the RCMP security force in a number of criminal wrongdoings. It seems that the McDonald Commission report put forward some recommendations to solve the problem for us. However, the problem was not solved.

After the McDonald Commission report, the Government brought forward Bill C-157, a Bill which was intended to put in place a civilian security force which would not have the powers we thought the RCMP had and which would not do the kind of things that the RCMP had been doing. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell), has said, that Bill was so bad that even the most lamb-like Liberal was aghast. The Bill died after receiving a devastating critique from the committee in the other place.

The Government then brought forward Bill C-9, a Bill which might possibly be a little bit better than Bill C-157. However, it still gives police state powers to the civilian security force. Under those circumstances, we are better off with the RCMP because the RCMP has a reputation across the country and has a contact with the public that a civilian force will never have. Consequently, it operates as a police force which is widely respected and loved across the country. If we are going to put into the hands of the civilian force powers which are unacceptable, without control or oversight by Parliament, then we are much better off with the RCMP security force. That is not to say that a civilian force is not what we really need, but at least under the old structure we were dealing with a group about which we knew.