

actual *Journals*. I do not think it is a sound basis for the quote from Beauchesne.

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the debate at report stage. In other words, I want to address Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** That is quite in order. The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) for that purpose on Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Blackburn:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the opportunity of speaking on Bill C-9 at second reading although I was limited to 10 minutes then as I am now. This is one of the most important Bills ever to come before the House in my time. I am in my fourteenth year in this Chamber. In some respects it is also one of the most odious pieces of legislation which we have had to deal with because of the intransigence of the Government and its refusal to, what I call, democratize, or I might even use the word "liberalize", the framework of this very important piece of legislation.

I can recall a few weeks ago speaking before the county council of Brant, the riding which I represent. That council is dominated by Conservatives and Liberals. They informally expressed very grave concerns about the arbitrariness of Bill C-9. Intrusive powers have always been looked upon with a tremendous amount of concern by Canadians. We are not essentially a criminal nation by any stretch of the imagination. There may be evidence, and no doubt there is, of terrorist or potential terrorist activities in our country as well as subversive or potential subversive activities. I would like to pay tribute to the work that the RCMP have done over the years in keeping our country relatively free of these most objectionable and heinous individuals who have from time to time arrived on our shores or may have been born here.

I ask myself why we must pass a Bill such as C-9 which would give a civilian security agency so much more power to legitimize the dirty tricks that the RCMP security division were guilty of back in the late 1960s and early 1970s and which brought this whole matter to the surface. I suggest that the dirty tricks were perpetrated primarily because there was not a chain of responsibility from the head of the security branch of the RCMP through to the Solicitor General and from the Solicitor General to the Cabinet and from the Cabinet to the Prime Minister.

There is nothing in this Bill which sets up that direct chain of responsibility. In a democracy it seems absolutely incredible that we, the people's duly elected representatives, would allow a secret police force to have such power that it is not directly responsible to any of the people's representatives. If you look at the Bill carefully you will see that the Director General is not obligated to report on every aspect of all the activities which are going on at any given time within the security force. Even if he is asked by the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) or ordered by the Cabinet or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), he is not obligated to present all the information that he has at his disposal. He can be very selective. In other words, the Bill

### *Security Intelligence Service*

gives arbitrary, virtually dictatorial and indeed authoritarian power to the Director General of this proposed security agency. That is anathema to me, as one who believes in democracy. I do not believe for a moment that the Solicitor General can argue that to protect ourselves, our country, our laws and our institutions, we need that kind of authoritarian power. I went through the intrusive powers, as we all have, at second reading and committee stage.

● (1250)

The other point I want to speak on very briefly is the oversight committee. In West Germany there is a parliamentary oversight committee. We in this country often tend to think that the American police forces, such as the FBI and CIA, have such untrammelled and unlimited power that it is dangerous. We are talking about a security agency in this country that is somewhat analogous to the FBI. We have the impression that the FBI has tremendous power. However, in the United States, because the FBI abused that power which it developed by hook or by crook since I believe the early 1930s, the U.S. Congress in its wisdom set up an oversight committee.

Let me quote from an article in *The Globe and Mail* of February 11, 1984, written by Mr. Jeff Sallot, in which he refers to that oversight committee and what the chairman of that committee of the House of Representatives had to say about the laws and powers that we are about to give to this civilian security agency in Canada. He says:

Congressman Donald Edwards—

He is an elected representative of the people, as we are here as Members of Parliament.

—the chairman of the House of Representatives committee which scrutinizes FBI activities, said that the 'loose' definitions of threats to national security in the Canadian bill would never be tolerated in the United States.

He is referring there to an oversight committee, not some ancient Privy Councillors who may have sat in the House 25 years ago or indeed never run for public office but were somehow appointed to the Privy Council of Canada as friends of a Prime Minister. He was referring to a committee of Congressmen who represent congressional districts and are elected directly by the people. They are on that oversight committee in the United States to ensure that the FBI does not break the law and is not guilty of dirty tricks.

That is what the New Democratic Party is asking for. We are asking for an oversight committee composed of parliamentarians. What does the Solicitor General have against parliamentarians? What does the Cabinet have against parliamentarians? Are we not trustworthy? Can we not be expected to do an honourable job in making sure that the civilian security agency operates according to the regulations and laws that we gave it in the first place? That is what is important and what is at stake. That is a fundamental democratic principle on which we base our arguments with respect to the oversight committee.

The third point I want to make concerns the powers that the RCMP already have through the criminal justice system. As I read the Bill, the civilian agency would take over many of