

Security Intelligence Service

they could not have brought in Bill C-9 which we are presently debating under closure.

Bill C-9 is being forced through the House. Incidentally, the Solicitor General probably has very little respect for the Chamber in terms of this Bill. Not only has the Government brought in closure, but if we read the Bill in effect it indicates that the Solicitor General and the Government do not trust the House of Commons to act as a safeguard against the powers which the new security service would have, because they would not allow a committee of Members of this House to have access to Cabinet documents in relation to activities of the security service. In other words, the Solicitor General, the Prime Minister and the Cabinet say: "Yes, we trust the security service, but we do not trust Parliament; however, we want Parliament to pass this legislation". As a parliamentarian I say no. If I cannot be trusted, then I am damn well not going to support a Bill which will put implicit trust in a secret organization that is virtually answerable to nobody that is not answerable to the democratically elected representatives of the people. I just do not like it.

Let us look at the powers the Bill will give to the secret service. The agency would have access to all records of government and private records. The only exception would be census records, which were included in the original Bill, Bill C-157. Thus the Government would have access to family allowance applications, unemployment insurance documentation, private, medical and psychiatric records, tax returns, confidential legal files, journalists' notes and all other documentary material. They could break into any place to obtain access to these documents, including one's home. The only requirement to obtain these powers would be a warrant from a Federal Court judge.

Let me talk about judges very briefly, because we are down now to ten-minute speeches. I remind the Solicitor General—I am not drawing an analogy here; I am drawing a historical perspective—that in 1933 when the Nazi party seized power as a result of two elections in Germany, Hermann Goering was charged with the responsibility of gaining control of the judiciary in the State of Brandenburg, which in effect was the City of Berlin. He said that if he could get control of the police and get control of the judges, he would have a dictatorship for his leader, the Führer. Within a matter of months, judges had been taken in and called upon to make decisions which they knew were morally wrong and reprehensible, but under the pressure of the *Gestapolizei* in Brandenburg they were forced to relinquish their independence and their rights on the judiciary. Once they had sold themselves out to the secret service and the secret police of the Nazi party, that was the end of democracy in Germany. It was not done in the ballot box. It was not done by going to the barricades as they had tried in 1923 in Munich, in the infamous Putsch. It was done by very subtly getting control of the machinery of justice.

I am not saying that this is the intent of the Government. I am asking, who knows? In five years' time or in ten years' time that could happen here if it could happen in such a civilized country as Germany which gave the world Bach and Goethe. I

will have no part of legislation which gives *carte blanche* to a secret intelligence service without giving the duly elected representatives of the people or a committee thereof oversight and control of that group. Otherwise Parliament is giving up its right to the security of the nation and the democratic rights and freedoms of the citizens of Canada. That is why I am voting no to Bill C-9.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, indeed I am alarmed today to have to speak on Bill C-9. I spoke on this Bill once before, on February 13, at which time I had an opportunity in a very constructive way to point out some of its shortcomings. Upon returning to the House of Commons after the weekend, I found that the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Deniger) in his speech on Friday had the following to say:

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-9 is the result of hard work and sustained efforts, and I support it without reservations. That is why I move, seconded by the Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans):

That the question now be put.

As I said, I was given an opportunity to take part in the debate in February. I was given approximately ten minutes to outline some of my concerns. I probably covered a quarter of the remarks I intended to make at that time. I can understand a government or a minister bringing in closure on a Bill that is very political. For example, I could understand the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) bringing in closure on the National Energy Program. I did not like it, but I can understand it. However, I cannot for the life of me understand why a motion was brought in on Friday to limit debate on a Bill that will affect fundamentally every man, woman and child in this country for generations to come.

● (1210)

Under Bill C-9, we do not have the type of security that exists, for example, in the United States where there is freedom to gain information. All of the points on Bill C-9 that were discussed in the Senate and the Senate committee before the Bill came to the House of Commons have not been addressed. Some very valid points were made. Why is the Liberal Government so worried about open discussions in this House?

Since coming to Ottawa I have learned that when a contentious Bill comes before the House of Commons, it sometimes takes two, three or four weeks of debate before Canadians right across Canada understand what is actually being proposed and they can have some input through their individual Members of Parliament. It takes a long time for the information to be disseminated among the hinterlands, to all constituencies. We have seen this time and again. When this process occurs, the committees are armed with much more material and much more thought goes into their deliberations.

I used to think that debate in the House of Commons was a waste of time. When Members opposite would get up to speak, or Members on this side, other Members engaged in conversa-