

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In ruling me out of order in moving a motion, you did not recognize me standing thereafter to speak in this debate. Either I was speaking on an adjournment motion or I should have been recognized to continue debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): I draw to the Hon. Member's attention, so that there will be no misunderstanding, Standing Order 41 which is quite clear. In part it reads:

No Member, unless otherwise provided by Standing or Special Order, may speak twice to a question—

I do not need to read the rest of the paragraph. In fact, the Hon. Member rose to propose a motion which was not accepted by the Chair. However, that means he is recognized as having spoken on this question and I cannot recognize the Hon. Member for a second time.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on Clause 2 of the Bill because I am concerned about the expansiveness of some of the definitions. Certainly the Hon. Minister and the Government should give some thought to defining these words much better than they are defined in Bill C-9.

I was rather amazed that the first act of the new Liberal leader was to announce closure on this important Bill. Surely the consideration of whether we have the RCMP or a separate intelligence body is an important issue for the country, yet the new Liberal leader pronounced closure almost before his ears were dry from the convention. Certainly that was no tribute to the Liberal Party or to freedom of speech. I think the people of Canada should be aware of that. Surely to goodness a Bill concerning the authority—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. I hate to interrupt the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), but I have already referred to the fact that the motion before the House is the one which is supposed to be debated. I cannot accept continuous allusion to extraneous matters.

Mr. Taylor: However, Mr. Speaker, closure was announced today on this particular Bill.

Mr. Kaplan: You can speak on that tomorrow.

Mr. Taylor: Consequently, what I had to say was in connection with that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): I do not think the Hon. Member is wanting to argue with the Chair. However, I point out that if there is a motion proposed at some future date, that would be the time to speak on it.

Mr. Taylor: That is fine; we will certainly do that because the people of Canada should know that closure was his first act.

Let me deal with these threats to the security of Canada. I was raised in a coal mining area. I know what can happen if the words "security", "threats" and "activities" are not very carefully defined. When I was a small boy of six or seven years

Security Intelligence Service

of age, I recall that World War I had almost ended. Even now I remember the violence and the feelings which ran so high against German people on account of Kaiser Bill because many of our boys from the Drumheller area had lost their lives on foreign soil fighting for freedom to run our country the way we wanted. Some people felt that it was the time to get even. Two or three of them went at midnight to the home of a Canadian of German extraction who lived by himself. They had evil thoughts in their minds. They pounded on his door and broke his windows. Finally they were about to break in his door when he warned them by saying: "I have a shotgun; if you come in I will use it". They had no right to be on his property. He was a Canadian citizen. He was not responsible for what Kaiser Bill did, any more than the German people in my constituency were later responsible for what Hitler did. They had no sympathy with it. It was completely unfair to chastise them and put them on the spot, thinking that anything they did was in line with what the German leader did. But they did not stop. They broke in the door, and the Canadian of German origin used his gun and killed one of them. That ended that fracas. Then the police came.

In part, Clause 2 reads:

(c) activities within or relating to Canada directed toward or in support of the threat or use of acts of serious violence against persons or property for the purpose of achieving a political objective within Canada or a foreign state—

Certainly the freedom of unions to operate is highly political. Also the clause provides:

(b) foreign influenced activities within or relating to Canada that are detrimental to the interests of Canada and are clandestine or deceptive or involve a threat to any person.

The definitions are entirely too wide. Let us look at the strikes that take place in coal mining areas. I have referred in the House before to a number of strikes. When I was in grade 12 I had to walk through a barrage of people who wanted a particular union. My folks happened to be UMWA people, which I think is a splendid union. It has proven itself to be an excellent union. However, there were other people who wanted the Canadian union which, in my view, was headed by nothing short of a bunch of communists.

Was this a threat within Canada in which the intelligence corps should become involved and take sides? Those who were on the side of UMWA received threats that their houses would be burned. Many of them, including my own brothers and sisters, insisted upon going to work because UMWA was not on strike. The Canadian union was determined that no one would go to work. They broke car windows, threatened to burn houses and so on. These types of things take place, but who is to say which side happens to be loyal to Canada? I think both sides included many people who were loyal to Canada. Later on one of the leaders of UMWA became an excellent ambassador of the Canadian Government in another country. Certainly we could not say that the people on the UMWA side were disloyal to Canada. On the other hand, the convictions of a number of people were that the Canadian union should have dominance because they did not want funds going to the United States, to the UMWA. The UMWA has certainly taken funds from Canada to United States. During the depres-