

Security Intelligence Service

activities I was involved in. Obviously the RCMP felt that there was something subversive about it. But my purpose was simply to write a number of papers on a variety of foreign affairs issues.

When I discovered that there were long lists, files, reports and briefs which various agents of the RCMP had submitted about my various activities, all of which were of a scholarly and academic nature, I began to wonder about the extent to which fundamental freedoms exist in this country. Of course I was pleased, as were all Members of Parliament, when the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was introduced and passed in the House, part of which included freedom of association. I believe that all of us believe very strongly about that. People who want to work together in organizations should be allowed the freedom to do so. Yet the Bill before us makes it impossible for employees of the new service to bargain collectively. This right has been denied all of the representatives of the new intelligence service. Again, this is something embodied in the Constitution of Canada, embodied in the freedom of association clause within the Charter of Rights. To think that we are being asked now to support a clause in this Bill that goes against the very charter that all of us supported in this House of Commons seems to be bordering on the ridiculous.

● (1900)

That is not the worst, Mr. Speaker. When you consider that my hon. colleague from Burnaby worked so hard in committee at a time when the committee was discussing the need of the agents of the security service to swear an oath of secrecy, part of which would suggest that they would never be permitted to comment on the affairs of the service and that they would be required to carry out unlawful activities as we have all come to know them, you might say, Sir, that surely we should not be asking members of this Security Intelligence Service to carry out illegal activities.

I must say that I was shocked when I first heard from the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) that we were being asked to pass a Bill which suggested that members of the agency should be allowed to break into one's home, office or private property in search of information or intelligence material, and that it would be appropriate for agents to open first class mail at their will, having received a judicial warrant. We know how successful that is in terms of screening. Last year out of every warrant requested, virtually every single one was immediately approved. It is hardly the type of security people would accept as protecting their rights and freedoms. Breaking into private property, opening up first class mail, going into tax records, family allowance records and all Government documentation about an individual, having access to all private information, being able to tap telephones, and I can go on with a whole list of activities, is not in the best interests of the nation. Yet we are saying in this Bill that members of the Security Intelligence Service will be permitted to do all these things in the so-called best interests of the nation. That in itself leaves a lot to be debated.

In the clauses we are presently debating we are being asked to support the concept of individuals taking an oath of secrecy. The suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Burnaby to include lawful activities as part of this swearing in process was denied. It perplexes and concerns me that the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) would want to permit members of this agency to carry out unlawful activity under the direction of the director or other officers within the Security Intelligence Service.

When you start hearing about these various areas which cause serious concern to those involved with civil liberties in Canada, with fundamental freedoms for Canadian citizens, innocent Canadians I might add, one has to wonder, because clause after clause these shortcomings are being brought to the attention of the Solicitor General. Virtually every clause we have debated to date, and there is a whole list yet to come in the days ahead, we will be identifying the concerns we have as parliamentarians. Yet not a single one of those concerns has been answered in this House. I am hopeful that eventually we will see Members opposite rising in their places to answer some of the concerns we have. Can they explain why asking people to take an oath of secrecy that will require them to carry out unlawful activities is something we should support? I would like to hear the justification for that. I would like to hear the justification that it is appropriate now for members of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service to break and enter in pursuit of evidence, to open private mail and to get into all sorts of government confidential records. How can this be in the best interests of Canadians? How can this be in the best interests of creating an atmosphere of security in the country? This escapes me. I am hopeful and optimistic that Members opposite will shortly stand in their places and explain that we need not be concerned for these reasons. However, one does remain optimistic these days, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of the clauses we are presently debating, I must say that the points raised cause real concern, so much so that, if an adequate response is not provided, we will certainly have to vote against these clauses as they are brought forward.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on examining the amendments that came from committee and the proposed amendments here at report stage, I regret the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) did not include one to delete Clause 4. It is there that I find what is a very definite looseness in drafting as a result of an amendment put forward in committee. But because I am precluded from making any changes, since there is no amendment at this time, all I can do is to invite Hon. Members to look at the provision to see if the term "pleasure" applies during the second term.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would draw the attention of the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) to the fact that Motion No. 12 specifically refers to Clause 4 and in fact it would delete Clause 4. That will come in due course.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point is well taken. For the information of the Hon. Members in the House, we are now