

It is that kind of concern, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Council of Churches has. It is that kind of concern which is held by our Party and by many other groups which came before the committee. The definition of "threats to the security of Canada" is much too broad. Who decides what the legitimate interests of Canada are? It is not even going to be the Liberal majority in the House of Commons which decides, because it does not have to come before it for that kind of definition. Perhaps it could be some member of Cabinet or perhaps some overzealous member of the proposed security service itself who decides. It is worthwhile noting that in testimony, the Minister admitted that the great majority of the proposed members of the security service would come from the secret service of the RCMP, the very people who were involved, along with Hon. Members of the Government, in the kind of illegal activity which took place in the late 1960s and early 1970s, for which justice has not yet been done. The Canadian people want to see some action taken to assure them that their civil liberties and their human rights will take a higher place in courts of law than the Government's priorities, whatever they might be. We are concerned that the vague definitions in this Bill can target peace activists and people who are concerned about Central America or South Africa. They can be targeted with all the kinds of intrusive devices which this Bill is offering. We are concerned that this Bill and this clause open very wide the door to very great government intrusion into the lives and activities of ordinary Canadians and respectable Canadian organizations. We do not have the kind of checks and balances in this legislation which we would have liked to have seen.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the motion of the Hon. Member for Burnaby to delete Clause 2. I hope that all Hon. Members on both sides of the House will recognize the wisdom of what we are saying and move with us to delete this clause.

● (1400)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[English]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

BICENTENNIAL OF NEW BRUNSWICK

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, today marks the bicentennial anniversary of the Province of New Brunswick. In 1784 the British Government divided Nova Scotia, as it then was, and created a separate Province of New Brunswick. In 1867 New Brunswick became a founding province of Canada. Today the province stands as a memorial to all the people who contributed to its development. New Bruns-

wick has a multicultural heritage enriched by our native people, Empire Loyalists, Acadians, people from the British Isles, Europe, Asia, Africa, the United States of America, indeed, from all parts of the world.

Today a special stamp will commemorate the occasion. It will be unveiled in the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick. All year, and every year, Canada's picture province will welcome our fellow Canadians and visitors from around the world to share in our hospitality and the warm New Brunswick welcome that awaits them.

* * *

FINANCE

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WOMEN'S POSITION ON CHILD CARE EXPENSE TAX DEDUCTIONS

Mr. Mel Gass (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the following letter which I recently received from the P.E.I. Women in Support of Agriculture:

Dear Sir:

At the annual meeting of the P.E.I. Women in Support of Agriculture, a resolution was submitted and passed by which we agreed to make our views known to our Members of Parliament on the following subject.

Accordingly we are writing with regard to, and in criticism of the recent changes in the Income Tax Act dealing with child care expenses. More specifically, we take exception to the change which dictates, with few exceptions, that "whichever of you has the lower net income must claim the child care expenses".

Although this discriminates against any working mother, it tends to affect farm families to a greater extent. This is largely true since the farming spouse does quite often have a low net income for several reasons, and therefore must claim the child care expenses yet derive little benefit from this deduction in comparison to the working mother who actually pays the child care expenses.

In conclusion, it is our opinion that the benefits derived from increasing the allowable deduction for child care expenses to \$2,000 per child were largely offset by the addition of the "supporting person" concept to the Act, especially as it applies to the agricultural sector.

Trusting that you will give this matter your consideration and take some positive action with regard to the situation.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Wanda MacMurdo
President of the Provincial Women
in Support of Agriculture
Mrs. Rena Thompson
President of the Charlottetown Area Women
in Support of Agriculture

I support their stand, and I urge the Minister to take positive action and change the clause dealing with child care expenses, which discriminate against women, especially women in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: By agreement, the Chair would like to recognize the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), followed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney), and a spokesman from the New Democratic Party.