

Security Intelligence Service

the specific amendments before the House. I have deliberately listened with some patience and I find that the Hon. Member has yet to address specific remarks to the motion which seeks to amend Clause 1 by deleting it. I wish that he would come to that matter soon.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I know the Chair will recognize that over the course of the debate thus far on Motion No. 1 the Chair has allowed considerable latitude in view of the fact that we are dealing with Motion No. 1 and Clause No. 1. If the Chair reviews *Hansard*, the Chair will indeed find that the debate has ranged over a very broad number of areas respecting the fundamental principles of the legislation. I recognize that Motion No. 1 does deal with the title. I say with respect that if we are guided by the wisdom of the previous occupants of the Chair and indeed the present—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The present occupant of the chair is the Chair. I have been participating in the debate. The Hon. Member for Burnaby of course feels that he is raising a valid point of order. However, the Chair takes a different view. The Hon. Member for Burnaby will recall that debate was initiated on Motion No. 1 so as to allow Hon. Members, the Chair and the Table officers to come to some understanding as to the grouping of the motions before the House. It was with some licence that debate was allowed to extend somewhat. The rules were not strictly applied in that very specific and particular context. However, that matter has now been settled. It is my duty as occupant of the Chair to ask Hon. Members to limit their remarks strictly to the motion at hand as is the standard practice in the House at report stage. I invite the Hon. Member to continue his remarks.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I was going to continue in my remarks to try to make a case for giving the Bill the title "1984" rather than its present title. The title "1984" is more representative of the contents of the Bill than the present title of the Bill.

It is darn shameful that a Government, which parades itself as the champion of the individual and of free thought in the Liberal tradition, should introduce a Bill which creates one of the most draconian secret service agencies in the western world. The Government, which introduced the Charter of Rights, at the same time introduces this piece of legislation which takes away the very freedoms and rights which the Government has given with the Charter of Rights. With this piece of legislation it yanks those freedoms and rights away from the Canadian people.

That is why we on this side, the churches, university teachers and provincial attorneys general right across the length and breadth of the country are outraged at this piece of legislation. We are outraged at the tactics of government Members in committee. We are outraged at how they are shoving down our

throats a piece of legislation which is as important as the Charter of Rights and the Constitution. In fact, the independent Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) made a very valid point the other day. He said that the two most important pieces of legislation were the Constitution and this Bill. Yet, at the end of this long session and the life of this Parliament, we see the Government introduce a Bill and insist on something on which there is no national consensus. Enlightened, concerned and educated people right across the country are opposed to this.

● (1620)

One must ask the pertinent question: why does the Government continue with this Bill? Why does it continue with legislation that could be used to remove legal and medical files of individuals who might be protesting the state of unemployment or the state of poverty in this country? For instance, those files could be used against farmers who are demonstrating against farm bankruptcies. They could be used against native organizations or any group of people who want to see some basic change in the social and economic structure of this country.

That is why we introduced Motion No. 1 that we are debating today. We are opposed to this Bill starting with its title. As I mentioned, there is a long list of people who are opposed to it, including even members of the Government. The former Solicitor General, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) is outraged at this piece of legislation. Yet the Government continues to push ahead with it.

I think we are all aware that currently societies all over the world are experiencing very rapid technological, social and economic changes as well as psychological changes. We will see human displacement on a scale that we have not seen since the advent of the Industrial Revolution. This displacement will lead to periods of discontent. Yet, believing as we do in the democratic process of our society, we hold true to the belief of open debate and discussion so that a new equilibrium of power sharing will evolve.

This Bill will suppress legitimate opposition. People who are suffering within the present economic and political structure will be forced underground because they will have no sense of security that they will be able to raise legitimate debate in this country. The Bill will simply be an excuse to go underground. Violence begets violence. If the mentality exists that there are spies and terrorists under every bed, lo and behold you create the reality that you set up to protect yourself against. That is my prediction while debating this Bill. It is like a mirror image. The Government is opening the way to the very reality that this Bill is supposed to be protecting us from.

Why is the Government so insistent on this legislation? The police forces in this country already hold power that very few police forces in the western world hold. I am told that there are some 800,000 files on Canadian citizens. The power that the police already have is quite awesome. Does the Government suspect that there are 800,000 spies and terrorists in the