

groups appreciated the opportunity to present their briefs and concerns to the special committee of Parliament. That first-hand experience which I gained very recently on a very important issue in Canadian society gives me an experiential feeling as to the value that having such hearings would bring to Bill C-9 which is under discussion.

We in the New Democratic Party have a number of concerns, as has been mentioned. The definition of the "threats to the security" of Canada in Clause 2 gives us great concern. We feel that this definition should be significantly narrowed in scope so as to ensure that this new service does not engage in surveillance of what could be lawful dissenting activity. We have had good representations. I listened to some of the debate earlier this day. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), expressed the concerns that various churches have raised with regard to subparagraphs (c) and (d). The Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) of the Conservative Party was very concerned that if he spoke to the Western Canadian Concept party he may become a target of surveillance. I will not comment on whether he should be a target of surveillance. He expressed that concern very cogently in his representations.

We feel that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should have a mandate to deal with domestic surveillance according to the criminal standard, as is the case in the United States. This would of course involve the deletion of subparagraphs (c) and (d) in the proposed mandate of this proposed agency. We are very concerned about this very broad, general, vague and threatening definition of the threats to the security of Canada as contained in Clause 2.

One of the elements of concern which we have expressed has been in conjunction with the criteria for the various security assessments. In 1982, some 75,000 people in the federal Public Service had to get security clearance. There is not an adequate set of criteria to examine the security assessments which it is proposed should be conducted by this new civilian security service. We feel that any criteria which may be imposed should be put in a statute or that there should be some sort of regulation which would be made public and gazetted. In that way the public would have an opportunity to examine the criteria. In addition to that, the agency should be subject to some sort of review by a parliamentary oversight committee. We feel that these criteria for security assessments must be looked at very carefully. Furthermore, we feel that the security assessments should be made either by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or by a branch of the Public Service Commission, as was recommended by the McDonald Commission.

In addition, we are concerned about some of the broad implications of this Bill. Clause 16 of this Bill confers a new and unprecedented power on this new civilian security service which would target individuals who, we feel, pose no threat to the security of Canada. We feel that this clause would include political refugees, professors who are visiting lecturers at universities or even business or labour leaders. This power does not exist at present and we feel there is no justification for including it in the statutes at this time. I would remind

### *Security Intelligence Service*

Members of the House that the Canadian Association of University Teachers expressed itself on this particular matter. It has expressed concern that the security force may impinge on the activities of any visiting foreign professor or any foreign student at a Canadian university. We definitely want to underline that particular concern.

Finally, I would like to discuss the review process. In his submission before the McDonald Commission, the Leader of the New Democratic Party said that there should be a small parliamentary oversight committee. The suggestion was made that this parliamentary oversight committee could be modelled after the American congressional oversight committee. That structure seems to be effective in monitoring these types of activities.

Given these considerations, we feel that our proposal for a series of public hearings across Canada is justified. We think that the proposal has merit since there is going to be such a great impact on the public. We feel that people deserve an opportunity to express their concerns, an opportunity to voice how they feel and an opportunity to give their suggestions to see what needs to be done in this area.

• (1650)

I notice, Sir, that you are nodding your head after signalling that my time has expired. I thank Hon. Members of the House of Commons for giving me this chance to express my concerns on Bill C-9.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton.

**Mr. Dick:** Mr. Speaker, an hour and twenty minutes ago a point of order was raised by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The Speaker said he was doing a quick search of the premises to find out whether, at report stage, the committee minutes giving the evidence were available. There was some doubt as to whether or not debate could continue when the evidence itself was not in printed form and available to all Members, because all Members do not serve on the committee. The time of one hour and 20 minutes is more than sufficient. I walked downstairs to General Distribution a few moments ago—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Is the Hon. Member speaking on a point of order or making a contribution to the debate? The Chair would like to know.

**Mr. Dick:** I was rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I recognized the Hon. Member for debate.

**Mr. Dick:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Can the Chair advise us whether or not it is in a position, an hour and 20 minutes afterwards, to make a ruling?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for his question. I am aware of the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West but the Chair is not in a position