

*Security Intelligence Service*

Something else which concerns me as well is that it is not just the churches, Mr. Speaker, who have expressed their concern, but a number of other groups such as the Canadian Civil Liberties Association have done so also. That is a highly respected group which involves a lot of Canadians. It has said to the committee as well as publicly that it is very concerned also about the extent of the discretionary powers which are allowed to be used by the new security service, for example, the snooping power through electronic devices, bugging devices, through all kinds of searches, through mail openings, or through invasion of confidential records. These groups say that these powers are too sweeping under the legislation the way it is written. There is too much discretion being left in the hands of the security service itself, or in the hands of the Government, in terms of deciding how far the security service can or should not go. These are concerns, as I said, not just of a few of us, but of the Canadian Council of Churches and of the Civil Liberties Association of Canada. I can also tell you, Mr. Speaker, that those are the concerns of a lot of average citizens as well.

I said earlier this morning that the United States has a much greater record of political violence. It has experienced the unfortunate assassination of several of its presidents, including the attempted assassination of President Reagan a few years ago. Despite that, the FBI does not have the sweeping powers this Government across the way wants to give to the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. I suggest that you would probably agree that Bill is giving unnecessary power to the security service. That is not a very good thing for our society. It is unnecessary and it is going to provoke more harm than good.

● (1700)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Order, please. It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—  
MOTIONS**

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Shall all orders and items preceding No. 115 stand by unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT**

**AMENDMENT RESPECTING INTERNAL ECONOMY  
COMMISSIONERS**

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West)** moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of amending Section 16(1) of the House of Commons Act to provide for the appointment of additional members as Commissioners of Internal Economy from the House at large, and to provide for the remuneration of the Commissioners appointed pursuant to the said section.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have just reviewed my file on this particular question of amending the provisions with respect to the Internal Economy Commission, and I see that I first raised this point almost ten years ago. In October of 1974, at the opening session of Parliament, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) moved the nomination of four of his Cabinet colleagues to the Board of the Internal Economy Commission, I rose on a question of privilege and challenged the view that hitherto I had been given by the Prime Minister's Office, but one which was severely challenged in other sectors, that the commissioners had to be from the Cabinet rather than simply Privy Councillors as provided for in the Act. It is a question of determining which Privy Councillors. In May of 1980, I put forward Bill C-273 which amended the Senate and House of Commons Act but which did not provide for any remuneration. In drafting the terms of this motion I followed the proposal put forward and ready to be tabled in the form of a Bill by the Government of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) in December of 1979. It would have added to the board and provided for some remuneration.

I will read from a letter I wrote to the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead on June 19, 1979. I am sure that he will not mind if I read this although he is the recipient and the owner of the letter now. I was suggesting to him that one of the questions he would have to decide before the newly elected Government met Parliament was this question of the board of Commissioners of Internal Economy. I said:

You may recall that on the opening of the session October, 1974 I raised a question of privilege about the practice of naming exclusively as commissioners four members of the Cabinet and contended that it was within the power of the Prime Minister to include members of the Privy Council who are not of the Cabinet. This would have allowed wider representation including from the Opposition among the commissioners.

It is not that I contended that the practice of naming Cabinet ministers exclusively was in itself illegal but I felt that it was not necessary to do so, contrary to the opinion of the then Prime Minister. In this matter I was supported by our caucus because it was a view that Mr. Speaker should be ultimately assisted by Commissioners of Internal Economy representing the House generally. In order not to open the House of Commons Act for amendment and in order to achieve this, it would be a first step to name Privy Councillors who are not members of the Cabinet among the Commissioners of Internal Economy.

I agree that one or two of these commissioners should be members of the Cabinet as the government party has an undeniable right to majority representation on the Board of Internal Economy.

May I interpose here to say that this could also apply to a number of my colleagues opposite who are, like myself, not of the Cabinet. We are Privy Councillors but we are not of the Cabinet. My reason is that Cabinet Ministers are so busy that it is very difficult to get them together for appropriate meet-