

ment at this late date to change its mind. However, let us hope that, with the building of public concern, perhaps it will listen. It has certainly been very slow and unresponsive at committee stage, and I can only urge people in the community to speak up forcefully and try to stop this monstrous piece of legislation before it is too late.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap)—Trade (*a*) Effect of clothing and textile imports. (*b*) Request that Minister meet industry representatives; the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo)—Regional Development (*a*) Workers' co-operatives—Request for government support. (*b*) Housing co-operatives; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Labour Relations (*a*) Increases in corporation executives' salaries. (*b*) Dome Petroleum—Executives' remuneration.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE ACT MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-9, an Act to establish the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, to enact an Act respecting enforcement in relation to certain security and related offences and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof or in relation thereto, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and Motion No. 1 (Mr. Robinson) (Burnaby).

**Mr. Dick:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** On a point of order, the Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick).

**Mr. Dick:** Mr. Speaker, in looking at page 7 of the Order Paper for Tuesday, June 12, Motion No. 19, which is included in a number of motions listed, does not have the name of the mover behind it, which would be on the next page, page 8. I am wondering whether we could be informed as to who, in fact, is moving Motion No. 19? Or is it printed in error in the Order Paper?

### *Security Intelligence Service*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** The Chair will take the point of order of the Hon. Member under advisement. Continuing debate.

**Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, we are at the report stage of Bill C-9. I just want to take a few moments to indicate one aspect of the committee's work which is now being reported to the House. Motion No. 1 with respect to Bill C-9 before the House is a motion put forward by the NDP critic of the Department of Justice, the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), that Clause 1 of Bill C-9 be deleted. I believe no further example need be shown of the rather destructive, negative, obstructionist point of view of members of the New Democratic Party in respect of this whole matter. After all, Clause 1 of the Bill is merely the title clause. I notice that there will be some discussion later, and perhaps a ruling from the Chair, as to whether or not that particular clause is in order. However, in any event I want to take advantage of the fact that Motion No. 1 is before us to indicate that one aspect of the committee's work has been a disappointment to me.

In committee, I believe a number of Hon. Members from all sides of the House were disturbed by the impression the public is receiving that this Bill is going to deal with an agency which is going to be all-inclusive and quite comprehensive in respect of security intelligence matters in this country. In actual fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Not only, of course, will this particular agency have jurisdiction in the security intelligence field, but within the Government itself there is authority, sometimes statutory, sometimes non-statutory and merely by Cabinet delegation for a number of different ministries, other agencies and other organizations within the Government to be involved also in the security intelligence-gathering field. This, basically, is the nature of my complaint.

● (1630)

The Department of National Defence, for instance, has some very large areas of jurisdiction respecting the gathering of intelligence. During the committee hearings I, for one, was instrumental in focusing the attention of the committee on some work being done by another agency within the Department of National Defence which has the jurisdiction to intercept, monitor and interpret long distance telephone calls within North America which happen to be sent over various microwave systems. As well, the Department of External Affairs is obviously quite heavily involved in security intelligence gathering. This is outside the country, but nevertheless they do it. One of the most important agencies for gathering interpreting security intelligence in the Government has not really been discussed in public, either before the Pitfield committee or before the House of Commons committee, that is, the work and functions of the Privy Council Office in respect of security intelligence gathering.

Having been a Solicitor General, I have reason to know that there have been occasions in the past when the right hand of Government in the security field did not know what the left hand was doing. On several occasions prior to 1979, the