

Security Intelligence Service

[Translation]

Mr. Tardif: Mr. Speaker, clearly I cannot speak on behalf of the Government. But as far as I am concerned, this is a matter to be settled by the Consultative Committee which, on the basis of circumstances, will decide whether or not such information should be made public.

[English]

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary might in fact answer the question. It is a very straightforward question. Is the Government going to be making public the names of those agencies of other countries with which the security service will be exchanging information?

[Translation]

Mr. Tardif: I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, he does not believe so. In other words, Canadians are going to have intrusive techniques used against them and information is going to be given to unnamed agencies in unnamed countries.

● (1550)

My final question concerns a very important issue. Following up on the recommendations of the McDonald Commission, the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) indicated that no disciplinary action whatsoever had been taken against members of the security service for the wrongdoings and breaches of the law which were identified in the report of the McDonald Commission. The Solicitor General has said that disciplinary action had been taken. I want to ask the Parliamentary Secretary, which one is accurate?

[Translation]

Mr. Tardif: As far as I am concerned, may I indicate to the House that to my knowledge, there are some ten cases where proceedings were instituted in Quebec.

[English]

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I was not referring, of course, to criminal prosecution. I was referring specifically to disciplinary action taken within the RCMP security service.

Is the Parliamentary Secretary now indicating that in fact disciplinary action as opposed to criminal prosecution has been launched against any members of the security service?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair may not have listened as attentively as it normally does to the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary's speech, but under the provisional rules of the House which allow for this period of questions and comments, questions should relate strictly to the comments raised in the course of the Hon. Member's speech and should not introduce new elements. As I say, I give the benefit of the doubt to the Hon. Member and will allow the Parliamentary Secretary to respond if he so pleases.

[Translation]

Mr. Tardif: In response to the last question, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Solicitor General did indeed answer to that, namely that proper steps have been taken concerning disciplinary action.

[English]

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise as a second member of this Party to debate Bill C-9, an Act to establish the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

Before I begin my remarks I have one or two comments to make respecting the speech made by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). It is always interesting to listen to him because he was trying to allude to the fact that this Party was somehow not defending the interests of Canadians. Yet I personally know that our Members were out across the country speaking against Bill C-157. But that Hon. Member was right out of the saddle immediately, so much so that he was kicked out of the justice portfolio by his Leader. He was actually denounced by his Leader and put on the back-benches. Of course, he was denounced by his Party.

With respect to the divorce legislation, he was up in a flash agreeing with another government Bill on divorce, only two weeks later to find that once again he was repudiated by his Party since they are actually opposed to the Bill, having followed the Conservative Party.

When he talks about those states which interfere with people's rights and how the NDP will protect people's rights, I ask him, who has violated people's rights more than the socialist countries in the world? Who is the vice-president of the Socialist International? His own grand, glorious Leader. What a shame it is.

I believe that we should never forget the history behind this legislation. I think there is no doubt that Canadians have been concerned about this issue for many years. Royal commissions, which began their work 15 years ago, said that we needed to have a civilian security service or one that was isolated from the RCMP.

This ultimately led, some 15 years later, to Bill C-157. That Bill was so defective, in spite of the fact that the Government had been addressing this issue for 15 years, that it did not even dare bring it up for debate on second reading. Following first reading of the Bill, broad segments of the country, after a cursory examination, raised such a ruckus that the Government had to defuse the situation. It did so by referring the matter to a Senate committee, which then made over 40 major changes to the Bill.

While this is a relatively small Bill consisting of some 46 pages only, its effect will change the entire nature of the country over a period of years. I have always been astounded by the thinness of the Bills and the major effect that we as parliamentarians have on the lives and future of our fellow citizens. This is true whether it is a constitutional Bill, the omnibus Criminal Code Bill we are considering or a short Bill such as Bill C-9.