

*Security Intelligence Service*

this Bill, which is designed to allay our fears respecting some elements of personal privacy and civil liberties and at the same time provide an efficient framework for our protection from foreign influences, both hostile and friendly, ignores this rapidly expanding capability. Part II of this Bill facetiously labelled "Judicial Control" is a fraud. I for one will not vote for legislation that is so seriously flawed.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in the debate and to oppose Bill C-9. I am a little surprised at the motion of the Liberal Member that the question be now put. Knowing him a little bit, I know that he knows full well what it means. What it means is that Members on this side of the House, on behalf of our constituents and all Canadians, now do not have the opportunity to put forward amendments. We could allow Canadians to have some understanding of what are the major flaws of this Bill by debating them. What effectively happens now is that the Liberal member, after only three Liberal members have spoken on this important legislation, has put a gag order on the House so that the debate will gradually run out by allowing us only 10 minutes to speak. This is a gag being placed on parliamentarians who would either want to move amendments themselves or participate at some greater length in an important debate relating to security service legislation.

● (1230)

Be that as it may, the Hon. Member says that he is a soldier. I am sure that the gun was held to his head by the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) or someone else in order to force him to move such a motion. However, there are three key elements in this legislation which must be scrutinized carefully. Canadians can be certain that this Party at least will fight here in the House, in committee and, if the legislation comes back to the House, again in the House to make sure that changes are made to the legislation or that it is blocked. Those three key areas to which I refer are the proposed mandate, the powers which are to be granted to the security service and the oversight, an area which I would have expected the Solicitor General to be more supportive of. However, he is apparently not.

Let me give a very brief history of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. I think I am the only peace officer in the House and the only person who is not a lawyer who has worked within the criminal justice system. Therefore, I have some idea of the larger venue of crime, and here I am thinking of international crimes such as smuggling and heroin importing. I have been involved in such trials and have some idea of the deficiencies found by the RCMP in terms of dealing with that kind of international crime. I am aware that there is some need for the expansion of a service to help with those deficiencies.

I was present in the House one day when the Solicitor General was berating members of the Official Opposition for not allowing this legislation to move quickly so that the Pope could be protected while he is in Canada. I do not think that that kind of fear-mongering is necessary, proper or realistic for

the Solicitor General to be presenting to the Canadian public as a reason why this kind of legislation should be rushed through. Quite clearly, our traditional police forces in the country should be capable, one would hope, of protecting the Pope and others while in Canada. This security service is being proposed for quite another reason, as I think I will be able to reveal as I deal with Bill C-9 as it exists even with minor changes from the previous Bill C-157.

In 1976, it was revealed that the RCMP security service had been involved in a number of criminal wrongdoings in the Province of Quebec. We have been looking at security service matters in one way or another since 1969 with the Mackenzie Commission. However, in 1977, the McDonald Commission of Inquiry was established, one of the most expensive and long standing royal commissions Canada has ever seen. The McDonald Commission sat until 1980 and held hearings across Canada looking into security-related matters. Mr. Justice David McDonald and his commission found that there had been widespread institutional lawbreaking by members of the Canadian security service.

One of the things which I think is very germane to this debate is that to this time, no RCMP security service officers or members have been prosecuted for illegalities outside of the Province of Quebec since the revelations of the McDonald inquiry. I think that that fact really leads into this debate and shows why members of the Official Opposition will have to struggle even harder to ensure that the civil liberties of Canadians are protected. Those liberties were not protected even when the Government across the floor knew and had all of the evidence to show that federal statutes had been broken. No actions were taken. The Solicitor General has indicated that certain actions were taken against individual members, but what was really done has never been revealed either to us as Members of the House or to the general public.

At the foundation of what I have just said is the simple fact that the Canadian judicial system was subverted by the actions taken in the past by the RCMP security service. It is our responsibility as legislators to protect Canadians. The Solicitor General might think that he is the only legislator but my constituents expect me to ensure that legislation is passed in this House which protects their interests as well as the interests of the country as a whole.

Following the rejection of Bill C-157 not only by this Party but by most of the Attorneys General, by civil libertarians, academics, editorialists and a broad section of the Canadian public, the Solicitor General decided to send the Bill to the Senate and have Mr. Pitfield, who had been involved in this matter before, rewrite the Bill a bit. It is interesting to note that when Bill C-157 was introduced, the only Party in the House that publicly opposed the content of Bill C-157 was this Party. The public record will prove that.

**Mr. Lawrence:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Fulton:** The Hon. Member says that that is nonsense. However, the public record has been checked and it has been discovered that the only person to my right who had anything