

*Security Intelligence Service*

else can get away from it. What should be clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, is that nothing has changed as a consequence of the weekend. The Government Party now with its new leader is just as determined to continue the tactic it has used so far, which is to accept no amendments whatsoever, then to make every effort to make sure that those amendments which have been put forward cannot properly be debated.

Referring specifically to your ruling, I understand perfectly the rule which Your Honour asks us to address, that is, whether an amendment which could charge the review committee as set up in Bill C-9 to examine other than just the security service is such a departure from the Bill that Your Honour cannot accept it in this Chamber at this stage. That is your specific point. That is what you have asked me to address.

• (1530)

I want to remind the House that under Clause 38 the Government has insisted that the Security Intelligence Review Committee should only review the operations of the service and no other agency dealing with Canada's security. The Progressive Conservative position is put forward in Motion No. 94. It was argued in committee and was the subject of a great deal of discussion. That position is that the committee should have as one of its functions the review generally of the effectiveness and propriety of Canada's security and intelligence functions and arrangements wherever such functions and arrangements are carried on in the Government of Canada.

For those who might argue that this motion brings in some separate notion, I would point out that the security service has been in existence these many years and it will continue to be exactly the same security service when Bill C-9 is passed. That security service is dealing with every other element of intelligence gathering within the Canadian system. It is naive and ingenuous in the extreme to suppose for one minute that a security service operates in this country without having a great deal of interaction with other intelligence gathering agencies or groups within Canada. One of them, of course, is the communications security establishment of the Department of National Defence; and, of course, another is the Department of External Affairs.

The rationale for this amendment is that the Security Intelligence Service will be interacting every day with other agencies and institutions of this Government which are engaged in security information and in intelligence. The Security Intelligence Service, for example, may—and I would say it goes beyond “may”; it will be receiving information from the communications security establishment of the Department of National Defence and certainly from the Department of External Affairs. It is our position that the committee must be able to assess the reliability of such information that the service may act on. In addition, the committee must also be able to look at all such functions in order to determine whether certain activities are being performed on behalf of the service and should be removed from oversight and review.

The whole object of this Bill is to establish by mandate a set of rules which will try to establish in the minds of the Canadian public a sense of trust that the security service indeed has clear direction and at the same time is properly constrained. The point I am making is that it is impossible to expect the review committee as set out in this Bill to effectively review the activities of the security service which everyone knows relate to other information gathering agencies in the committee cannot examine that relationship. That is the substance of my argument. It has been set out quite clearly by others speaking before me and it may well be repeated.

The other issue is that Your Honour is now caught in the unpleasant situation of being asked to rule on these matters, as is your duty and responsibility, at a time when a new leader of the Liberal Party has obviously sent a direction to the Solicitor General to put closure on this most important Act, which Alan Borovoy has stated recently contains some of the greatest threats to the security of Canadians since the beginning of Confederation.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair would like to indicate at this point that there seems to be agreement with regard to Motion No. 89. The Chair will rule that out of order. The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) indicated he accepted it. The Chair would like to reserve judgment on the other two motions, No. 93 and No. 94, and will attempt to render a decision at the earliest possible time after reviewing the record of the House.

**Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, we are now dealing with a most important issue. We saw the Government move closure on second reading. We saw the Government refuse to take amendments in committee, as well as try to stifle debate. Now we have the Government, led by the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), moving closure on Bill C-9. Closure under a new Prime Minister who is going to be more open and less arrogant towards Parliament and the Canadian public. In view of the continued arrogance of the Liberal Party and the disrespect shown for Parliament and for the Canadian public, I would like to move this motion:

That this House now adjourn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** The Chair has received the motion from the Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller). The Chair would refer the Hon. Member to Standing Order 8(3):

When it is provided in any Standing or Special Order of this House that any business specified by such Order shall be continued, forthwith disposed of, or concluded in any sitting, the House shall not be adjourned before such proceedings have been completed except pursuant to a motion to adjourn proposed by a Minister of the Crown.

Because of that Standing Order I cannot accept the motion of the Hon. Member.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no special order or House order with respect to the conduct of the business at the present time, so surely to goodness a motion to adjourn under these circumstances is entirely in order. That Standing Order is not applicable in