

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Again with all due respect, I hope the Hon. Member appreciates the point the Chair is attempting to make. If I may be permitted, I will make the point that at report stage we must be relevant to the motion, and this is very much in keeping with our practices and traditions, and I would be happy to quote the relevant citations if the Hon. Member so requests. Remarks must be strictly relevant to the motion at hand, that is, to the amendment that I have just cited. I do not in any way intend to restrict the Hon. Member's freedom of expression, but the rules are clear. His remarks must be restricted to the motion now before the House. I plead with him to abide by that practice.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, I will indeed endeavour to follow the very strict rules which you in your wisdom are applying. The motion before us is that we should delete the short title. I am trying to make the point that because of the very negative effects of the Bill, because of its doubtful value to the Canadian people, it should indeed go forward to the Canadian people without any name whatsoever. It is an illegitimate Bill and it should be without a name.

Canadians are generally perceived as being a people who are very respectful of authority, just as Members of this House are respectful of the authority of the Speaker. I presume that a good deal of this respect for authority, certainly in English Canada, is the result of our United Empire Loyalist heritage. This respect for authority is not to be despised, it is not a negative trait, but neither is it to be abused. This Bill abuses our traditional respect for authority, and that is why I want to see the name deleted.

● (1610)

The authority of the state is perceived by most Canadians as being a guarantor of our rights and freedoms. Through this Act the authority of the state will be used to subvert and take away our rights and freedoms. We have had a long struggle in Canada and in our respective ancestries in Europe and other parts of the world for responsible Government. We have had to struggle to ensure that the state did not trample on the rights and freedoms of individuals. This Act, which should go forward without a name, would establish a security service which would undermine the guarantee of the rights and freedoms of individuals. Instead of seeing the state as the guarantor of our rights and freedoms, Canadians will see the state as the perverter and subverter of those rights and freedoms.

It is a sad day when we must debate this kind of an Act. That is why I support Motion No. 1 to delete the title. In the long run it is going to subvert the very respect for authority which many people have remarked upon as being a very Canadian characteristic. Many people appeared before the committee which was considering this Bill. The great majority of them have been very apprehensive about the effects this Act would have and the way in which it would destroy rights and freedoms. It is on that basis that I am supporting this motion and saying that the title should be deleted and that this Act should go forth into the world without any name at all, if the Act itself is passed.

Security Intelligence Service

I would like to share some of the concerns which were raised. Rev. Dr. Donald Anderson, the General Secretary of the Canadian Council of Churches, sent a telegram which reads as follows:

Bill C-9, An Act to establish the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, should not be passed by the present Parliament until: (a) it makes clear and rigorous provision for the accountability of the service; (b) defines national security and describes more precisely those activities which are illegal under the Act; (c) provides for the continuation of a free and vigorous participatory society in which work for justice on behalf of the poor, the marginalized and refugees may be carried on without fear of surveillance and prosecution.

That is from the Canadian Council of Churches speaking on behalf of a wide variety of Canadian Christians. That is one reason we feel that this Act should go forth into the world without any title, if indeed it is passed at all.

It is interesting that when the moderator of the United Church, Dr. Clarke MacDonald, had a message read into the record of the committee, the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) objected to this and told him he should mind his own business. This reminds me of King Henry II asking who is going to get rid of this turbulent priest, referring to Thomas à Becket. The attitude of the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton is perhaps indicative of the whole approach of the Government toward this Bill, which is that it is wrong for people to speak out. Somehow a moderator of the United Church is not minding his business when he tries to warn the Canadian people that this Act is potentially dangerous, urges that there be public hearings, and suggests, that unless certain safeguards are put in it, it should be withdrawn. It is on that basis that we feel that this Act is harmful, that it should not have a title, and we urge that Clause 1 be dropped. We have heard similar representations from the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Canadian Medical Association.

In conclusion, I urge that this first clause be dropped and that the Bill itself be dropped until proper safeguards have been built into it to ensure that the security service will be responsible to Parliament and not to some nameless committee appointed by the Party of patronage.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, indeed it is a sad day. We are in the month of June of the year 1984, the year made famous by the British author, George Orwell. In his book *1984* he portrayed a society in which individuals had lost all of their civil liberties. In that society a mind police operated which stamped out any individual thought, and government propaganda was the only information people could read. George Orwell coined the phrase "doublespeak". Doublespeak is what the government used in its propaganda. It means saying one thing while actually meaning something else. Indeed, as we debate Bill C-9 today, we see all these warnings by George Orwell come true.

We are debating a Bill which could allow wiretapping the phones of those Canadians raising money for—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair really regrets to interrupt the Hon. Member. At this time debate should not be so broad that Members can address remarks to the general principle of the Bill. Members must address their remarks to