

*Security Intelligence Service*

ment policy. I am thinking particularly of the commitment of the people who live in the riding of Nanaimo-Alberni to disarmament and the activities which those people feel obligated to carry out when protesting the present Government's attitude toward the Cruise missile guidance testing.

Without fully considering and understanding this Bill and the powers proposed to be given to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) and the secret intelligence service, my constituents would probably think that those powers may be warranted and necessary. However, they would not feel that those powers were warranted or necessary if they in fact thought that they themselves were going to be victims of wiretapping, surveillance, first-class mail openings or security access to family allowance and medical records, as provided for in this Bill.

The Minister has always been critical of Members who talk about the widespread powers granted by this Bill and has indicated that investigations and wiretaps are only allowed under a Federal Court judge's warrant. We have seen many applications under the Criminal Code for such warrants and very few if any of those applications are turned down. This Bill does not provide the kind of protection required by Canadian citizens if in fact the powers in this Bill are warranted at all.

We in the NDP believe that the powers in this Bill remain too broad and ill defined to be acceptable when protecting the civil liberties of all Canadians. While the Bill was based upon the contention of the McDonald Commission that policing and intelligence gathering should be separated, the Government has not accepted suggestions for the careful definition of the mandate for the service. As indicated by Roy McMurtry, the Attorney General of Ontario, the definitions within the Bill are dangerously vague. We in this Party accept that very important criticism.

Canadian citizens may still be subject to the all-intrusive techniques of the security service provided for in this Bill. It must fall upon Parliament to design a security Act which, while protecting the national security as we all desire, will also protect the freedoms of law-abiding Canadian citizens. We must protect against the recurrence of 800,000 court files being collected by the RCMP security service because of inadequate legislation, instruction and surveillance by elected government and ministers.

It is interesting to note that Conservative members are once again sitting on their hands while this Bill works its way to committee and possible enactment without safeguarding Canadian citizens by more narrowly defining the mandate of the service. We do not see the Conservative Party mustering the number of speakers from which we would expect to hear in this debate.

**Mr. McDermid:** How would you know? You just got here.

**Mr. Miller:** Members opposite seem to think that this Bill would be quite adequate if it were to be brought in by a Conservative government. I would like to read the comments of the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) as reported on page 1304 of *Hansard*:

As the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) said, if this legislation had been introduced verbatim by a previous Government, such as the St. Laurent Government, the Diefenbaker Government or the Pearson Government, it probably would have raised very few eyebrows because there was a sense of confidence in those Governments and the leadership at that time.

The problem we face today is a crisis of confidence in the leadership of the Government. It is not only incompetence that bothers us, though there are plenty of examples of rank incompetence by the Government. What really bothers the Canadian people is that the Government enjoys the use of power. Since it derives so much pleasure from power, there is no discipline, constraint or self-control in the use of power.

If Conservative members think that this Bill is not good, then it will not be good under a Liberal Government, a Conservative Government or a New Democratic Party Government.

**Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills):** Mr. Speaker, I now join other Members in rising with some alarm, because I was away on Friday of last week. I was in my riding attending a nomination and indeed my own nomination. To return to the House—

**Mr. Riis:** How did you make out?

**Mr. Thacker:** Well, I am sure Hon. Members will be surprised to hear that I won the nomination.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thacker:** The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) is certainly surprised. She will be even more surprised when she finds out that I won by acclamation.

I find that in my absence the government side has been up to its old tricks again. It is trying to deny the House and Canadians sufficient time to discuss this new Bill. While government Members are saying that this Bill has, in a sense, been before the House for a long time, it has not. This Bill originated with Bill C-157 which did not even come before the House. It was shipped off to the Senate when civil libertarians and ordinary citizens across the country began to raise a hue and cry. The Senate committee made over 200 recommendations for changes to Bill C-157. The Bill then went back through the government bureaucratic process and now out has popped Bill C-9. Government Members are saying that that has corrected everything.

● (1230)

That simply is not the case, Mr. Speaker. As Members of the House we know that it takes weeks and weeks for the essence of a Bill to sink in. Ordinary Canadians are busy earning a living and cannot devote their full time to the study of a Bill as we do. While it is quite proper that we are alarmed, I think we need to give ordinary Canadians more time on this.

Here I am, Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time on this Bill because I find that the Government is not prepared to give Canadians that time. It would appear that their own personal and political party interests are going to take precedence over the national interest. A Bill of this magnitude and importance should be given plenty of time for debate and reflection in the House, in committee and by Canadians at