

intelligence service for our land. It was pointed out by the Attorney General that no cogent reason has really been established yet in the House as to why we should have a civilian security service. That being so, it is a sad day when closure is introduced so soon after the Government side has elected a new leader without a seat in the House, and without really having an opportunity to consider in any degree of depth the Bill that is before us for consideration today.

● (2020)

The *Globe and Mail* editorial of April 24 last reported that, although Bill C-9 has fewer flaws than its predecessor, Bill C-157, it should not be allowed to pass in its present form. This was in an editorial in one of Canada's national newspapers. It pointed out that Bill C-9 would still continue to grease the wheels of the domestic intelligence service. This domestic intelligence gathering force, which is supposed to have the responsibility of protecting the public, will gather information at the expense of the rights of the public.

Unfortunately, we must agree that there is a need for an intelligence service in this troubled land. It is also the responsibility of the Government to ensure that Canadians are protected by such an intelligence service, that our national interests and security are protected. However, should that protection be at the expense of public rights and liberties that Canadians have a right to expect? While that protection of security is a responsibility of the service, in no way can it be said that our rights and liberties should be prejudiced and diminished by reason of the need for that protection.

Bill C-9 still empowers its agents with the judicial warrant system to demand, seize and detain first-class mail, examine the health records of Canadians and violate the confidentiality of income tax returns. The agents are still able to tap telephones, but the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) only says that the review committee will blow the whistle on the agency as soon as it steps out of line.

Canadians have been burned before. The agency, believing to be acting in the best interests of the country, rode rather roughshod over large numbers of Canadians and over the civil rights and privileges of ordinary Canadians.

Bill C-9 does not ensure that this will not happen again. Critics of the Bill are not instilled with confidence in the review committee or even in politicians or political hacks. The review committee would be made up of Privy Council members who do not sit in the House of Commons or Senate, but Privy Councillors nonetheless who are appointed by the government of the day. They will be paid by the Government. There is an old adage which states that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Perhaps at this stage I am not permitted to expand on the benefits of the RCMP or its history, but if there is any greater risk than placing the caretaking of the intelligence service in the RCMP, it is leaving it in the hands of politicians.

Bill C-9 makes no provision for an all-parliamentary review such as exists in West Germany or in the United States. Nor is the Solicitor General fixed with a responsibility such as recom-

### *Security Intelligence Service*

mended by the McDonald Commission of having knowledge and responsibility for the working of the intelligence service. The Solicitor General has put distance between himself and that agency. He has done this through a director and a review committee and has not given the faintest hint of any acceptance of an all-parliamentary overview of that director and the operations of his agency. That is left up to some persons who are appointed by the government of the day.

Even though there is a public demand which requires such an opportunity for an all-parliamentary review of an operation of such an agency, it has been denied to Canadians through this Bill.

Furthermore, despite all of the assistance offered to him by Opposition members and the witnesses who appeared at the committee hearings, the Solicitor General is either unable or unwilling to write a bill that would command the general national support of our people. Instead, he has introduced closure today, the first legislative day after his Party elected a new leader. He is the future Prime Minister but the Government, without the opportunity for its new leader to study this legislation, introduced closure. This is an arrogant approach by the Government. It is a sad day with respect to a totally incompetent Bill when it should take such action.

**Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen):** Mr. Speaker, I was particularly prompted to make a few comments on this Bill by some of the remarks made by my colleagues, including the Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) and the Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

The Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills spoke of the manner in which the committee hearings were conducted. The statements and opinions expressed by individuals who appeared before the committee were almost unanimous in their recommendations for changes to some of the particulars of the Bill. He also stated that the recommendations have been ignored, which casts doubts about the entire question of having committee hearings into the subject.

This was characteristic of what recently happened with respect to the committee hearings on the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. When public hearings were held in that regard, 14 of the 14 witnesses who were quoted in a paper presented by an observer to the standing committee for its perusal stated that seven non-Canadian directors on the institute was too great a number. The Bill provided for eight Canadian directors and seven non-Canadian directors which these witnesses felt was too heavily weighted toward non-Canadian directors.

How did the standing committee deal with those recommendations? It simply ignored them. It took advantage of the Government majority to pass Clause 18 of that Bill as it stood. It allowed seven non-Canadian directors on a board of 15.

● (2030)

When the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills was speaking of a similar experience with respect to the security Bill, it prompted the question: Why do we hold hearings? The