

*Security Intelligence Service*

Surely the Government should have the authority and the right to remove the Director for whatever cause the Government thinks is essential in the security interests of Canada.

Our amendment in committee to Clause 6, one of the amendments my friend from Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has in front of the House at the moment, will be supported by us because our own is not there. That was an oversight. It is exactly the same. It involves the necessity for the Minister, not in a permissive way but in a direct and mandatory way, to issue directives directly to the Director. That would be an improvement to the Bill.

The amendment that we have moved to Clause 12 would make it necessary that when the duties and functions of the service are being considered, they would be those strictly necessary for the security of Canada. With regard to Clause 19, on the question of the release of private information we moved an amendment that only private disclosure should be made on the discretion of the Minister, not just the Director.

On Clause 20, we have moved that the federal Attorney General should report to the provincial Attorneys General with respect to relevant illegal activity as a consequence of knowledge gained by the security service.

On Clause 21, we moved in committee and will want to move again that warrants not be issued unless on reasonable and probable grounds. It is a better definition for the onus required on the part of the security service to obtain a warrant than merely on reasonable grounds.

We have also moved amendments to limit the warrants with respect to Canadians who have not yet committed any crime. That refers to sub-paragraph (d) of the definition section. We have further moved amendments that warrants should only last for 60 days before renewal, which is the amount of time specified in the Criminal Code, not a year as set out in this Bill. We have moved amendments to tighten requirements in the affidavit.

With regard to Clause 22, we have moved an amendment with respect to the renewal of warrants and eliminating renewal of warrants in cases coming under Sub-clause (d), which is the domestic clause covering legal activities of Canadians.

On Clause 24, we have moved an amendment to clarify the role of innocent third persons who are ordered to do things by somebody who has a warrant, thereby clarifying the liability that innocent third persons might otherwise incur.

On Clause 31, we have moved that the Inspector General have access to Cabinet documents relevant to directions to the security service. That is absolutely essential if the Inspector General is to have any overview.

On Clause 38, we have moved that all security agencies in Canada should come under the review committee established by this legislation.

● (1220)

On Clause 39, we again made the amendment that would allow the review committee to see Cabinet documents, because it is quite incredible that a review committee would not have

access to documents that may actually change policy or give specific orders to the security service.

Regarding Clause 55, we moved to establish a parliamentary review committee which, if the preliminary ruling is to hold, is an amendment with which somehow the House of Commons cannot deal.

With regard to Clause 61 of Part IV, we moved an amendment which would give the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, acting under the direction of the federal Attorney General, the duty to consult with municipal and provincial police forces. That seems to us to be only common sense.

With regard to Motion No. 2 which the preliminary ruling would rule out, we made a number of amendments which deal with that area of the Bill that has created the most concern for the witnesses who came before us. Those amendments are designed to clarify the language of Clause 2 in order to make it quite certain that those activities which are to be investigated are activities which are against the security interests of Canada and not simply the interests of Canada. We dealt specifically with Sub-paragraph (d) of Clause 2 in order to make that clause much more acceptable to those Canadians who are concerned about the intrusion of surveillance on Canadians who have not committed any crime and who are operating only within this country.

I know that my time is limited at this stage of the debate. However, I would like to put this on the record because the amendments which we are putting forward are important amendments, particularly when taking into account the words of Mr. Alan Borovoy, the general counsel to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association. He spoke about this legislation as it was reported out of committee because it was not amended in committee. The Government did not want any amendments. As reported in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, Mr. Borovoy said that the legislation creating a new civilian spy force is "one of the greatest threats to civil liberties Canada has seen in many years". As a consequence, we think these amendments are important. They are not too excessive and I would hope that they would be heard.

**Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills):** Mr. Speaker, I rise with some sadness at report stage of this Bill because we are again faced with a situation in which NDP members are helping the Government achieve one of its goals while loudly protesting what the Government is doing. NDP members are actually helping the Government because they are going to force the Government to put time allocation on report stage and third reading stage and we will not have the opportunity to debate the great issues raised by this Bill. Once again the Liberal Party West is helping the Liberal Party East to bear down on the Canadian people and oppress them under their thumb, which is exactly what they want. They want an all-powerful central state that will press down upon the people and turn them into serfs.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Bill C-9 is the second most important Bill we shall debate in this Thirty-second Parliament. I believe the Bill that was most important was, of