

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 19, 1984

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Monday, June 18, 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 Motions Nos. 10, 16, 20, 25, 26, 28 and 35 (Mr. Robinson (Burnaby)).

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of the motion to delete Clause 3 from Bill C-9. Clause 3, Mr. Speaker, is the proposed Section setting out the establishment of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. I have indicated in earlier remarks that I accept the fact that Canada, like every other country, needs a security service. It needs a security service which will protect the interests of Canada. I am not very concerned whether that security service should be a civilian security service or a part of the RCMP.

I recognize the fact that, for many years, and even today, the RCMP had and has an excellent reputation. It has earned the respect of most Canadians. Therefore I am not too worried about the question of where the new security service should be lodged, either as a civilian service or as part of the RCMP. What I am concerned about is that its mandate should be crystal clear. It should know what its job is, and what its responsibilities are. It should know what it can do and what it cannot do in order to fulfil its mandate.

● (1110)

For many years most people in Canada knew very little about the work of the security service. There were people in trade union movements, universities, student and church organizations who had a feeling that the security service was keeping an eye on them, infiltrating their organizations, even though they believed that the things that they were doing were quite legitimate and did not need to be spied upon. But they

had no real evidence that this was happening until a few years ago.

I was a Member of this House when stories began to circulate about some of the activities in which the security service had been involved. I remember that, as each story came out, the then Solicitor General, first the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand), and later the present Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox), assured Members of this House, the media, and the general public that these were isolated cases. Well, either they had not been told what was going on or they did not want to know. The McDonald Commission looked into all these questions, and in fact they did not know what was going on.

Eventually we had the prosecution of a former RCMP officer, Mr. Samson, which, along with other things, led to the establishment of the McDonald Commission. It spent several years, heard hundreds of witnesses in public and in secret, and made a report which ought to have caused a great deal of hard thinking and anguish on the part of all Canadians. The situation was in fact very, very serious. The report said that the security service had been involved in the theft of membership lists of a legitimate political Party, involved in burning barns, and in the theft of dynamite, and wire tapping. Those are just a few of the activities in which the Security Service had been involved.

Eventually the McDonald Commission made a number of recommendations calling for legislation to set up a new security service to make clear what its job and responsibilities were, what its officers could and could not do, and what they should be able to do in order to fulfil their mandate. We have had at least two Bills from the Government supposedly dealing with the problems, and making proposals on how to deal with the recommendations. The first Bill died because there was so much opposition to it. It was clear that the Bill and the proposals were deficient.

● (1115)

Now we have this second Bill which was referred to the Senate and had a number of changes made to it, based on the recommendations of the Senate. The Minister has said repeatedly that it is only a small group of malcontents who are opposing that Bill for political reasons, or because they do not understand it. But the Bill is still being opposed by very important non partisan groups in the community. I will list them very briefly. They are the Canadian Conference of Churches, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the provincial Attorneys General, and organizations such as the Canadian Jewish Congress. Such organizations appeared before the committee and made very detailed critiques of the