

am referring to the presentation toward the end of the Bill of an index. The House will recall that I made quite a fuss about an index for the rules of the House. I am delighted to see the practice is beginning to grow in the development of Bills, particularly complicated ones like this, and that we have if not an index at least a table of contents in Bill C-9. An index is also helpful.

I notice in Bill C-19, the amendments to the Criminal Code, that there is a table of contents. It might be described as such although it is done alphabetically and this one is done on a clause by clause basis, beginning with the first clause and continuing through. It is called a "Table of Provisions". It is a healthy and commendable development in drafting complicated legislation. I am grateful to the Government for having done this. I wish to compliment the Government officers in the gallery for carrying it out. Whether they initiated it or whether it was done on orders. I am not sure, but it is a commendable practice which I would like to see followed.

Having delivered myself of the only bouquet I could find in this spring of the year with no daffodils, it is time to have a look at this Bill as well as at a number of other Bills which have been presented by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan). Three Bills have now been given first reading. Presumably in the course of time they will be presented to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Bill C-9 is one of the Bills to which I refer, the upgraded and somewhat purified version of Bill C-157 in the previous Parliament. There is also Bill C-10, the divorce Bill, and there is a third Bill which consists of 600 pages of amendments to the Criminal Code, covering everything from pornography to the jury system. These three Bills were presented within a week or ten days of one another.

The Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs will be looking at them, but I do not see how the committee will do it. There are two possibilities. Perhaps the Government has done it deliberately, having delayed the presentation of Bill C-9 for 15 years, just to show that it is earnest and determined to take action in certain fields so that it will be able to stand before the electorate in coming months. It will say it brought the legislation forward but the Opposition would not let the Government pass it, neglecting entirely the notion that no body of responsible people can pass three Bills of this importance and magnitude in the time between now and dissolution, which may be in three months, it may be in nine months. Even in nine months the divorce Bill and the amendments to the Criminal Code could barely be given the attention that each deserves.

● (1230)

Therefore I must question the sincerity of the Government in presenting this Bill when it had all the time in the world previously to bring it down. I am not questioning the public servants who drafted the Bill; they have no command over the time of presentation. That is a political decision. But I do question the political decision underlying the presentation of these three Bills so close to an election.

Security Intelligence Service

That is one criticism I have. There are a number of others. Unfortunately I was unable to be here on Thursday to hear all of the presentations. I did not have the text of *Hansard* when I left, so I could not study all the comments.

There is some rather unusual phraseology in the Bill which troubles me. I compare the text in Bill C-9 with the text in Bill C-157 particularly in so far as it relates to omissions. In Bill C-157 there was an admission that Canada had some friends. It included "Canada or any state, allied or associated with Canada"; "espionage or sabotage against Canada or any state allied or associated with Canada". The expression "any state, allied or associated with Canada" was deleted. Does that mean that, should we discover that there is in Canada a plot of some kind, espionage against one of our allies or associates, we would not be interested? Why was that phrase deleted?

It is my understanding that the Senate looked at that matter and said that it could easily be dropped. It was dropped in two places, in the definition of "threats to the security of Canada" under (a) and, if I remember correctly, under (b). I worry that we should be so neglectful of our friends that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service would not be empowered to carry out investigatory procedures against espionage or sabotage related to one of our allies or associates. We are isolating ourselves just a bit too much when we leave them out.

Canada of all countries needs friend, allies and associates. Here we are virtually saying "The hell with them. If they get into trouble, tough. We will look after our business through our Security Intelligence Service and not worry at all about friends and associates." That is one of the shortcomings of that deletion.

It has been my experience in this field and in many others that exchanges of information mean exchanges in two directions. If you have nothing to exchange or refuse to exchange, nothing is going to come in your direction. This is one reason I deplore the removal of those words from the original Bill and their deletion in the new version. It was thought in the Senate that the expression "is detrimental to the interests of Canada" would be broad enough to deal with that. I see no harm whatsoever in leaving in the expression about our allies and associates. We should be quite specific that that possibility is still there.

There is another aspect which has not yet been clarified. That is Clause (b) of the definition section which relates to activities "within or relating to Canada". If you pursue that notion "relating to Canada" and contrast it with "within", if there are foreign influence activities "relating to Canada" anywhere in the world, will the Canadian Security Intelligence Service be empowered to investigate and bring forward a report.

Is that really the intent of this Government, an intelligence service overseas? Do we intend to send spies abroad to see what activities are being generated "relating to Canada"? It has generally been understood that this Bill is of domestic dimensions, but that clause, which is still to be defined, suggests that it has broader implications as far as Canadian personnel and their investigative practices are concerned. If it