

What is so special about the threats to Canada? I suggest these motions should be supported. These draconian powers which are granted to this new super spy must be curtailed. On that basis, I urge the House to adopt Motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about Motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14 which deal with Clause 4 of the Bill. In the original statute this clause was different. After having heard the witnesses, the Government agreed that it would accept an amendment. It prompts the comment that on many occasions the Government was prepared to accept the evidence of the Senate committee, the McDonald Commission and our own committee, yet in other clauses that were equally reasonable and upon which Government Members themselves could see the logic of the change, Cabinet has decided not to accept it. I think it is fair comment that if the thinking of the McDonald Commission was proper on several of these issues, surely it is just as proper on other issues. I do not understand why the Cabinet accepted some and not others. Likewise the Senate. I would like the Minister to comment on that. It is not this clause in particular but some of the others as well. I would like him to think about it. Maybe he could give us the benefit of his thinking as to what occurred within Cabinet that some of the McDonald Commission recommendations were accepted and some were not, in terms of judicial warrants and so on.

Mr. Kaplan: Why do you accept some and reject some?

Mr. Thacker: My acceptances and rejections are based on evidence that we heard in committee.

Mr. Kaplan: So are ours.

Mr. Thacker: We have a disagreement then as to the weight that should be attached to the evidence we heard. The Minister will agree that some of his own Members felt in their questioning of the Minister that a change would be acceptable if the Minister did not. Is that because he and the Cabinet have vastly superior access to information, even though they did not hear the witnesses? This is a general comment I have about the whole process which has broken down in Parliament.

We have second reading of the Bill. In a sense, second reading is premature. It is only after you hear the witnesses that you get the broad scope of the Bill. I agree with those who believe that after the Bill is introduced for first reading it should go directly to committee. We could then hear the experts from the various fields. The committee could then recommend changes. At that point the Bill could come back at second reading and be discussed on principle. It would be easier for the Government to accept amendments at that stage, before we have second reading debate and it has been passed in principle. The Government at second reading of this Bill stood and defended the principle of it. It then went to committee. When faced with the many changes suggested by the experts, the Government will not accept them. The Government and its caucus are convinced that the Bill has been approved in principle and therefore cannot accept any changes.

Security Intelligence Service

Clause 4 dealing with the Director originally stated that the Director shall be appointed to hold office during good behaviour for a term not exceeding five years. We immediately picked up on the fact that the Director could not be dismissed by the Government if the Director did something politically improper or improper for reasons other than conduct. We therefore proposed the motion that the Director hold office at pleasure. That makes him much more accountable and responsive to the government of the day. That was a good amendment and I commend the Minister for accepting it. I wish he would accept some of our other amendments at the same time.

The Director at the expiration of his first term of five years can be reappointed for a further five years and no person shall hold office as Director for terms exceeding ten years in the aggregate. That is good. We should learn from the United States situation when Mr. Edgar Hoover was director of the CIA. He was in office so long that he collected dossiers on all people in public life. He was able to block appointments of people to public office, promotion of officials within the hierarchy of the United States administration and actually perverted the political scene in the United States because of the power he had built up in the office. We do not want that to happen. I am glad that the Director, as good as he or she may be, will have to leave at the end of ten years. If I had my way, that same rule would apply with respect to the Prime Minister, the Premiers and indeed to all of us in public life. After ten years such a person would have to drop out for at least one term.

There is no doubt that the Hill is an unreal place. There is the very real possibility of losing touch with what those at the grassroots feel about issues. We would be much more responsive if we had to stand down for a term after ten years in office.

Motion No. 12, which is an attempt by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) to have the whole clause struck out, is pursuant to his strategy that if he cannot have his changes, the whole Bill should be knocked out. I disagree heartily with his comments *vis-à-vis* the comments of my colleague from Vancouver South who presented his case in committee in a rational and logical way. If it would not have been for the Hon. Member for Burnaby, I feel the Government would have been more inclined to accept amendments. I think the strategy and tactics of the Hon. Member for Burnaby in committee so early on inflamed the Government and it took extraordinary remedies. The actions of the Hon. Member for Burnaby have been deleterious to the parliamentary process in dealing with this Bill. I know from talking with some of my colleagues on the Government side privately and off the record that they may have been inclined to accept more of these amendments had it not been for the actions of the NDP and the Hon. Member for Burnaby.

● (1150)

As I look at the further sections of the Bill dealing with the Director, I note that the Director has absolutely enormous