

tions or did work at their desk. I later realized that virtually every Member of this House reads the debate daily at his or her leisure. That is why the debate is printed in *Hansard*. I mention that to show the importance of having the remarks on the record.

This Bill involves a contentious issue. We will be forced to vote on it through a form of closure. That is fundamentally wrong. We are dealing with a cornerstone and foundation of a democratic society. This Bill will allow a judge to issue warrants for surveillance. The police will be able to intrude into the lives of individuals in such a way as postal surveillance. How is a judge to determine when a warrant for surveillance should be issued? Will it merely be based on the fact that it is requested by the security service? Every time they ask for a surveillance warrant, will it be issued? What kind of criteria are in place to discourage any service violating a person's fundamental right to privacy? That is a concern.

The Senate very clearly called for a balance between the gravity of a threat to security and intrusion into an individual's privacy. It will be up to the Minister to approve or reject the application for a warrant. The Minister moves in secrecy. He has Cabinet secrecy as well as departmental secrecy. When issuing a warrant, he is in no way accountable to the House of Commons. With no reflection on the present Minister, I say that no one in Cabinet or in this House of Commons should have such vast power. There is something wrong if a Member of this House would accept that thesis.

What power will the security service have? Should it have *carte blanche* mail-opening privileges? Will it have access to confidential medical and psychiatric records? Will the security service have *carte blanche* access to personal records? We do not know because that is not clear in the Bill. Should there be an annual report on warrant activity, as is the case with the Official Secrets Act? That is not part of Bill C-9. Is it not appropriate for the Government to table in the House of Commons an indication as to how many warrants are issued to the security service and, indeed, in some cases why they were issued?

One point that is very disturbing has been made by the provincial attorneys general. That is the connection between the security service and illegal activities. Canada is a federation of provinces with an attorney general in each province. However, the security service will operate completely independently of the provinces. Provincial attorneys general will not be informed of what takes place under their jurisdiction. There is much that is fundamentally wrong with this Bill, therefore, debate at second reading must continue before the Bill goes to committee.

I see you are signalling that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I urge all Members to consider very carefully what is being done because it will reflect on the people of this country for generations to come.

**Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to speak on this Bill some time ago. However, with the interest of the New Democratic Party in opposition to a

### *Security Intelligence Service*

number of points in this Bill, it is only today that I have the opportunity to stand in the House and make my personal comments, which, by the way, are the NDP position. I am somewhat concerned and surprised that I am doing this on a motion for closure which was moved last Friday.

The interest shown by the NDP in enunciating very strong reservations about the intent of the Bill warrants a longer debate on second reading than we have had up until now. As well, I think it would have been instructive to have heard some of the back-bench Liberal members indicate their concerns about the Bill, if they have any concerns. It is obvious that they cannot feel a great deal of commitment to the concerns of their constituents. If they did, we might have heard them making some representations to the Minister asking for greater control over the proposed Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

● (1220)

I think that, by and large, my constituents are supportive of a secret intelligence service of some nature within the Canadian Government. Whether that service is the RCMP or a civilian service really does not make a great deal of difference to my constituents. They do feel that there is a need in any country, including Canada, to have the ability to determine whether or not foreign nationals are undermining the autonomy and security of the country. They would in fact support a service with the ability to detect that kind of thing before we find ourselves in a dangerous situation. I think my constituents also feel that the security service would be there to protect them from foreign nationals rather than being involved in the surveillance of Canadian nationals who do not pose any threat to Canadian security.

I would think that if I were to take a survey, my constituents would be somewhat in favour of the intent of Bill C-9 if in fact that Bill offered them some protection. However, in the 1960s and early 1970s, my constituents were quite confident that the RCMP intelligence services did not exist to investigate my constituents themselves and were somewhat complacent about the role played by the RCMP in terms of wiretapping and surveillance activities. At the time of the McDonald Commission, my constituents found out about the RCMP wrongdoings which occurred in 1970 and that the RCMP was found to have files on 800,000 Canadians. I think that that was a surprise to all Canadians.

The fallibility of the present Criminal Code and the intelligence service operated by the RCMP is indicated by the fact that 800,000 Canadians, many of whom had not undertaken any illegal activities, were on file with the RCMP. We have no idea whether those files still exist or have been destroyed as was recommended. We have no idea how those files were used against any individual who was investigated by the RCMP and how that use might have affected 800,000 lives.

I am concerned by the fact that this Bill does not define "threats to the security of Canada" in a way which is specific enough to prevent the RCMP or a civilian security service from investigating groups which are dissenting from govern-