

is a very simple definition of what the parameters should be in this clause.

We have been bringing forward suggestions, and it is an example of the intransigence and the blockheadedness, if you will, of the Government and of the Solicitor General in particular, that he will not accept any reasonable amendment. The Solicitor General is the captive of his bureaucracy, but he is not capable of making a decision on his own without advice from his bureaucracy. It has told him not to put too many constraints on the service, not to give it too many difficulties so that it will have to be accountable. For heaven's sake, that would make it difficult for the service. It would have to work for a living. I am not alone, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you who else thought that this motion was required—

An Hon. Member: We are with you.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Over here we have quality as opposed to quantity, and I say to the House Leader of the New Democratic Party that I appreciate the fact that that Party is always willing to learn. I am trying to help the NDP—

Mr. Deans: When we come to vote on your motion, we will rise with you.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I know you will be with us. However, do not make it public, because every time you vote with us it causes me great political embarrassment back home.

What I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, is that the people who are in support of this kind of amendment are responsible citizens of Canada. They include the British Columbia Law Union, the Canadian Bar Association—not exactly a revolutionary crowd—the Attorney General of Saskatchewan and the Attorney General of Ontario. These people are involved in law enforcement and legal matters in their own jurisdictions. The Canadian Bar Association represents the legal profession across the country. Indeed, I believe I can go back to the Senate committee which looked at this matter. It indicated that it would like more precise language with respect to the mandate of this agency. All of these groups and the individuals whom I have mentioned have been supportive of the amendment, which our Party supports and which has been presented by the Hon. Member for Vancouver South.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you must ask yourself a question: What is so wrong with this proposal? Why is the Government so adamant in its refusal to accept as an amendment an eminently sensible recommendation? Is there not someone over on the government side who can stand up and give a rationale? Let it be just one Member, I do not care who. I would even accept the Solicitor General standing up and telling us why he thinks he cannot accept our proposal. But all we get is silence. It does not augur well for Parliament when Members on the government side refuse to defend their own legislation. Let us assume the agency got out of control; what would happen? We would have a repeat of what happened in early 1970. There would not be one person on the Liberal side with the courage to stand in his or her place and say that the legal processes of Canada are being abused. They are used to silence, to standing

Security Intelligence Service

by like patsies and to doing what they are told. If that is the kind of government we are going to have under the Liberals, you can well imagine how the people of Canada will respond. They will see the cavalier and cynical attitude taken by government Members who do not have the courage of their convictions. They will not stand up and tell us why they refuse to accept the amendment.

● (1350)

Mr. Kristiansen: They are training for the secret service.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Secret service is right. It should be called the "secret (silent) service". That is the way these people are operating with respect to this legislation. They do not have the courage of their convictions and they do not deserve to be on the Government side.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve under the chairmanship of the Hon. Member who just spoke on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. A more fair, adept and appropriate chairman I do not think anyone could ask for. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) talked about why we do not support this amendment, or why the Minister would not listen to the amendments. The facts are of course exactly opposite. Before Bill C-157 was brought in, the McDonald Commission held over 300 hearings, saw 150 witnesses and read 124 written submissions. Then Bill C-157 went before the Senate committee. It heard testimony from over 30 individuals and groups and over 50 submissions. A significant number of changes were made to that Bill. Ultimately it resulted in Bill C-9. Therefore, to suggest that the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) is not prepared to listen to amendments is just not in accordance with the facts.

The problem we have is that we have another amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). We have been subjected to a farce. For example, at the very last minute we had presented to us in committee something like 300 amendments of the kind being produced here today. The attitude is: If we cannot have it our way, we are not going to play. We are not going to help with legislation and we are not going to have debate.

Mr. Forrestall: What debate can you have with closure?

Mr. Cullen: The Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) hit the nail right on the head. The fact is that in participating in this debate one feels one is participating in a farce. There were some amendments put forward in committee on which we could have had good debates. We could have expressed our point of view and then had our vote. Unfortunately, as a result of the tactics adopted by the NDP—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I invite the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) to indicate to the Chair what motion he is presently debating. His comments appear to be of a general nature and of a very wide-ranging scope. I invite him to confine his remarks to the motions before the House.