

● (1210)

I would like to look at some of the provisions of the Bill which raise questions for us. I want to note with particular attention the provisions in Bill C-157. Clause 14(2) of Bill C-157 stated that the security service is not restricted from "remaining informed" about the political, economic and social environment within Canada. The Senate committee pointed out very clearly that that was a provision which would open the door to mischief and therefore would heap scorn on that. Let me turn to Clause 12(2) of the present legislation, which provides:

Nothing in this Act restricts the Service from remaining informed, through public sources of information, about the political, economic and social environment within Canada and matters affecting that environment.

There you have it, Mr. Speaker; nothing is changed. The Senate says get rid of it. The Minister keeps it. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, will the security service, when looking through the public sources of information, be reading newspaper articles about all of the citizens of Canada? To what kind of clipping service will the security service subscribe? On whom will the security service keep files? Should it be that we have exactly the same provision in this legislation and powers sweeping enough rather than restrictive enough? For the security of the public we need provisions that are proscriptive enough, not sweeping enough.

I come to Clause 14 of the present Bill which reads:

The Service may advise any Minister of the Crown on matters relating to the security of Canada that are relevant to the exercise of any power or the performance of any duty or function by that Minister under the *Citizenship Act* or the *Immigration Act, 1976*.

Why should the security service report to "any" Minister of the Crown? I thought the buck stopped at the Solicitor General. Is the security service now going to report to the Minister of Employment and Immigration? Is the security service going to report to the Minister of National Revenue? I thought the Solicitor General was accountable. What goes on, Mr. Speaker?

I am concerned about certain provisions. Let us take a look at Clause 21. I have a simple question. There seems to be a provision whereby the Solicitor General would have final approval over whether search warrants would be issued. Since he became Solicitor General four years ago, how many times has the Solicitor General turned down a request for a search warrant? Has he turned down any of the hundreds of requests that I am sure he has had? How many has he turned down?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. May I draw to the attention of Hon. Members that Members are not supposed to walk between the line of vision of the Member speaking and the Chair.

Mr. Friesen: I did not particularly notice that, Mr. Speaker. I know the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) does not know the difference between a union hall and the House of Commons so I expect that kind of behaviour.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Security Intelligence Service

Mr. Friesen: I did want to close with three particular provisions mentioned in an article that I read and which was written ten years ago. It is entitled "The Relationship Between Secret Services and Government in a Modern State". It was written by a Briton and the Brits understand the secret service because they have bungled it often enough. Therefore, they ought to know something about it. This person makes eight points that are very clear. I want to introduce just the first three and then I will be through. I know you are getting nervous, Mr. Speaker. First, he says:

—the operational front of secret operations should be as narrow as possible.

My concern with this legislation is that it is as wide as possible. The second point reads:

—intelligence requirements and priorities, both overt and secret, must be laid down at the national and political level, and never at the departmental-ministerial level.

I am concerned about this level. It is not fulfilling this proscription. The third point reads:

—to keep the *collation* of intelligence separate from *collection*; and ensure that ultimate collation on major matters is undertaken at the national level.

It is all important that we separate collection and collation. Therefore, I think we need to examine this legislation very carefully.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) with respect to the powers he referred to, certainly the expansive powers under Bill C-157. In view of the severe criticism which the Hon. Member has levelled against the provisions of Bill C-157—I know he indicated that he personally gave a speech in Toronto criticizing some of the provisions in Bill C-157—could he enlighten the House why it was that both his Leader and the official spokesperson for his Party refused to take any position whatever on that legislation during the entire time it was tabled in the House?

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I would think that I am just a burned out English professor. I would not think in such clinical terms as the experienced lawyer from Burnaby. He does not draw very clear distinctions. When I said last Friday that I spoke in Toronto, I spoke on Bill C-157, not on the present legislation. I would like the Hon. Member to understand the difference there.

With respect to our spokesman on the legislation and our Leader, I will let them speak for themselves.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, before asking my question, I would like to express my appreciation to the Hon. Member for stating accurately the position I took in my speech about wanting the Bill to be passed but not calling on Parliament to pass it in a speedy way or without the care such an important matter deserves.

In view of that, would his Party and the NDP be prepared to consider and be agreeable, because of the importance of the subject and also because of the realistic timetable we face in the remaining months of this Parliament, instead of referring the Bill to the Justice Committee, which the motion I placed