

Security Intelligence Service

group which gets involved in a conflict in another country could be subject to investigation.

● (1840)

The Minister wants the security agency to be allowed to scrutinize membership lists and to investigate every member thereon. In a democracy it is legitimate to have a Solicitor General who has that view of the world. I do not think that is the view held by the majority of Canadians. I suggest it is not the view which even 2 per cent of Canadians would hold. In my experience Canadians are a group of people who value their freedoms. They value their privacy and their approach to life, which is essentially a law abiding, co-operative approach. The thought that some hidden agency could begin to bug their telephones, open their mail and follow them is abhorrent. That is something which happens in totalitarian states like Russia. They have police forces which do that kind of thing. They have laws and rules which allow their police forces to do those kinds of things.

That is not our tradition, Mr. Speaker. If we are doing our job on behalf of the Canadian people, we should not allow the same old gang to put this Bill through by closure. We should amend this Bill. The RCMP should be in charge of security intelligence and there should be tighter definitions. I hope that every Member who stands in the next little while is going to re-emphasize the need for those tighter definitions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11) the recorded division on the proposed motions stands deferred.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 11.

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-9 be amended by deleting Clause 14.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of amendments proposed to certain clauses in this legislation. This particular grouping of amendments is one of three groupings which would delete various clauses from the legislation and would not in fact amend those clauses. There are two other groupings of that nature, motions to delete. It is very difficult, in the context of a 10-minute speech at report stage, to do justice to the broad range of concerns which are reflected by these motions to delete. I should indicate that this particular grouping of motions to delete deals primarily with questions of a more administrative nature with respect to the functioning and operations of the security service. I will attempt to summarize the reasons for the motions to delete in the course of the next few minutes.

The motions deal with some seven clauses. The first two majors which are touched upon by the motions to delete are Clauses 3 and 7. Pursuant to the provisions of Clause 3, the Governor in Council appoints the director of the new service. There is an indication of the length of the term of office of the new director. I made a motion suggesting that the director should only be appointed following a review of that potential appointment by a parliamentary oversight committee. That motion was ruled out of order by the Speaker. It certainly remains my view that Parliament should play a role in the decision on the appointment of such a key individual in the operations of the new service. At the very least, Mr. Speaker, the Minister should consult with Members on all sides of the House with respect to the appointment of such an important individual.

Clause 3 to which I referred is the clause which formally establishes the Canadian Security Intelligence Service and sets out its principal office location as being in the national capital region. I note as well that the Official Opposition tabled a number of amendments to Clause 3 which would maintain the security service within the umbrella framework of the RCMP, subject to stricter controls and a statutory mandate. As Members know, this Party supported that amendment in committee at second reading.

Clause 7 is a clause which deals with consultation between the director and the Deputy Minister with respect to warrants.

● (1850)

The primary purpose for moving to delete Clause 3 is that that clause formally establishes the service. It is our view that the establishment of this new civilian security service poses a serious threat to civil liberties. Rather than moving to set up a new bureaucracy that is secret, unaccountable and will have unprecedented intrusive powers which no other western industrialized country has granted to its security service, we should in fact be moving in the opposite direction.

There are a couple of clauses that are dealt with in these motions to delete that relate to the question of collective bargaining rights and the terms and conditions of employment for employees of this security service. I would note that,