

*Security Intelligence Service*

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, following the testimony given by Corporal Samson, a large number of questions were directed by all Parties in the House to the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) and to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), questions which they were unable to answer. This led to the appointment of the McDonald Commission. The commission took four years to travel across the country and take evidence from scores of people. It cost the people of Canada several million dollars. It found, and so reported, that members of the security service had been guilty of wrongdoing and breaking the law. There has been instances of barn burning, break and entry, theft of dynamite, opening of mail, and theft of a membership list of a legitimate political Party, the Parti Québécois.

I would just like to discuss that for a moment. I am opposed to separatism, whether it be in Alberta, Quebec or any other province. As long as we live in a democratic society, people will have the right to advocate separatism or anything else. What happened is that that Party, which believed in separatism, won an election, but not because of separatism. It held a very soft referendum which could not carry. According to the polls, it is now facing virtual extinction. The democratic process is working very well. Is there any reason for the security service or anyone else having the right to steal the membership list of any political Party? That is what was done.

This Bill legitimizes and makes legal all kinds of violations of the law which took place before the McDonald Commission held its hearings, violations which were planned at the highest level of the security service. They were probably—at least I hope so—hidden from the Ministers who were then in office. They are now condoned and even made acceptable and legal by the Bill.

I indicated when I began my remarks that I accepted the reality that Canada like any other country must have a security service. However, the powers given to a security service should be those which are necessary to meet the real security needs of the country. There need to be safeguards in the legislation to reduce and if necessary to permit the redress of any abuses of these powers.

It is being implied, because we are opposing this Bill, that somehow we are all alone, that somehow we are wrong and that we are just a bunch of kooks. As I indicated earlier, a host of organizations, churches, community groups, the attorneys general of the provinces and civil liberties associations have pointed out what is wrong with the Bill as it is today. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association believes that the powers the Bill would create are excessive and that the safeguards which it would adopt are inadequate. It pointed out that there was little or no attempt to gear the investigative response to the magnitude of the threat, and that virtually anything which falls within the wide definitions could justify virtually any surveillance techniques. It went on to indicate:

Under Bill C-157, the new security and intelligence agency will have far too much intrusive snooping power—electronic bugging, surreptitious searches, mail opening, and invasion of confidential records.

In common with the Official Secrets Act and the 1975 mandate, Bill C-157 would permit such intrusive surveillance techniques to be used for "activities directed toward" certain types of security related misconduct.

What is the scope of these words? Mr. Borovoy, general counsel to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, indicated just yesterday that Canadians who raise money for the rebels in El Salvador, South Africa or Afghanistan could find their conversations bugged and homes surreptitiously searched under Canada's proposed federal security legislation. We could add to that list. I am sure some of the activities of the Sikh communities in Canada in opposition to recent happenings in India could be misinterpreted by our security service. It has demonstrated again and again little sophistication or real understanding of legitimate protest movements. A group of Canadians of Jewish descent who support the Government of Israel or a group of Canadians of Lebanese descent who support some of the activities in Lebanon could be included in this list.

In my remaining time I should like to point out to the Minister that the Canadian Civil Liberties Association put before the committee which dealt with the Bill 21 concrete proposals or amendments that it thought the Bill would need before it would be acceptable. As far as I know, not one of those was accepted by the Minister. As usual, he demonstrated his completely slavish, unthinking support of the bureaucrats in his Department. For that reason I have no hesitation in opposing this Bill.

● (1550)

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party apparently supports this Bill. It is not willing to put up speakers. In fact, there are very few Members of that Party here to debate or to listen. In view of the long debate on the two Bills, Bill C-157 and this Bill, this debate is particularly important. Those of us who were not involved in the committee structure appreciate the opportunity to put this Bill in its historical perspective. I therefore ask your indulgence for a moment.

**Mr. Fraser:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) just said that the Progressive Conservative Party supports this Bill. She knows well that we have had speakers up since eleven o'clock this morning. She also knows that we voted against every part of this Bill in committee. For her to continue saying this is a flagrant disregard of the truth. That should be considered a question of privilege of all Members.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** I would very much like to, but I am afraid I do not, consider it a question of privilege. Rather, it is a point of debate. The point has been made.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the Hon. Member who just spoke will see that the Conservative Members will speak to these points.

**Mr. Fraser:** Where were you this morning?