

to say about this Bill was Elmer Mackay, the former Member for Central Nova. He is now the senior policy adviser to the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney). At that time he said that there were too many civil liberty safeguards in Bill C-157, exactly the opposite of what the Tories are trying to say now. However, that was the only public statement that was made at the time Bill C-157 was introduced.

Mr. Lawrence: Where were you? Were you at the Senate committee meetings?

Mr. Fulton: The Hon. Member asks me why I was not present. I am the environment critic for my Party and I have never once seen him or most of the Tory members at Fisheries and Forestry Committee meetings where I happen to be active.

The facts show pretty clearly where the Tories really stand in terms of this legislation. While the Pitfield committee was studying this legislation in the other place, all but one or two of the clauses that are now contained within Bill C-9 were unanimously endorsed by members of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Lawrence: Nonsense.

Mr. Fulton: Again they are trying to sit on both sides of the fence. All one needs to do is look at the number of speakers they have put up to discuss this Bill to date in terms of the number of speakers they are allowed to put up. We can see pretty quickly and accurately the position of Tory members. They support this legislation in the Senate and in certain circles. They pretend to debate against it in the House and yet, when the original legislation was introduced, all they said was that there were too many safeguards in the Bill, exactly the opposite of what was being said by provincial Tory Attorneys General across the country.

Three major parts of this Bill seriously jeopardize individual civil liberties in Canada and are not required in terms of the national security of the country. They are contained within the proposed mandate. Let us look at that mandate and see exactly what it means. The mandate is found in Clause 2 under the definition of threats to the security of Canada. Although some people who have looked very carefully at this definition feel that it has been somewhat improved by the Pitfield committee, it is still far too broad and even falls short of the recommendations of the McDonald Commission. Even the Attorney General of the Province of Ontario, Mr. McMurtry, has said that the mandate is dangerously vague. For example, Canadians who might be interested in sending funds to Nicaragua or to the Afghan rebels or who wish to be involved in any kind of activity outside of Canada may well find that their entire organization, be it a church or local community organization, could fall under the intrusive techniques of Bill C-9.

I have two more very brief points to make, Mr. Speaker. One point is related to the powers contained within this Bill. There is a complete absence of political accountability for both the legislation and the RCMP. The most important oversight, Mr. Speaker, is that the proposal put forward by the Solicitor General does not allow for parliamentary scrutiny even by a parliamentary committee. This would mean that those individu-

als who are democratically elected in the country and belong to the NDP, the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party and who represent all Canadians are being precluded from this committee. As the Solicitor General well knows, even the proposal that he has put forward, which is terribly flawed and will not protect civil liberties of Canadians, does not allow this little Privy Council group or the Inspector General to have access to the political documents given to it by Cabinet. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is terribly flawed legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

● (1240)

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have waited for some considerable length of time for an opportunity to discuss Bill C-9 in some detail. The Government has had the opportunity to concern itself with the security service and subject it to close examination and scrutiny for 15 years, but today it attempts to limit the consideration that the Bill deserves.

The issues before us are complex. The Government tries to draw a fine line between the security service, whose responsibility is the protection of the state, while on the other hand it says that we as a democratic nation are concerned with the rights and freedoms of each individual. We are travelling a fine line indeed, Mr. Speaker.

In 1969 the Mackenzie Commission recommended a separate security force. This brought before the Government the question of the "civilianization", as it were, of that security force. The result of the abuses that took place was the establishment of the McDonald Commission and the recommendation, like that of its predecessor, for the separation of the security service from the RCMP. Two years after receipt of that report the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) introduced Bill C-157. All Members of the House are aware of the controversy brought on by that Bill. Protest letters poured in from every imaginable group. With one legislative swoop the Solicitor General managed to offend just about every segment of the country. Too many people were afraid that Canada was to get its very own KGB.

There is a limit, however. A bad piece of legislation cannot be protected forever. Bill C-157 was referred to a Senate committee for study. Time does not permit me to go into the recommendations of the Senate committee, Mr. Speaker. In general, however, the senators were unanimous in their castigation of the provisions of Bill C-157.

After considering the recommendations, the Solicitor General and Senator Pitfield urge early passage in order to prove that the parliamentary process works. What would the result have been if we had been under the same pressure with respect to Bill C-157, Mr. Speaker? Senator Pitfield might be satisfied with Bill C-9, but we certainly are not.

Our concerns lie in three general areas, Mr. Speaker. First, the mandate given to a civilian security service; second, the powers granted to the intelligence service; and third, the accountability that goes with the necessary protection of a