

there is no public will to believe. There is nothing out on the street but suspicion. This could be the best piece of legislation ever put forward, but Canadians will not accept it because it is coming from a government whose mandate has expired and which has demonstrated consistently over four years that it is more attuned to the principle of closure and denial of speech than to anything else.

This proposition is coming from a government that has a borrowing Bill before this House. This Government is attempting to borrow 91 per cent of Canadians' savings, leaving nine cents out of every dollar for other people to borrow. This Government is forcing cost of living increases on the pensioners, on everybody with fixed incomes, on everybody with low incomes. And members of the Government would have us trust them to be fair, equitable and concerned? This just will not wash.

We watch Liberals leaping aboard a bandwagon to support a leadership candidate who is denying everything the Party has stood for. We see members of the Cabinet leaping aboard the bandwagon talking about the importance of charisma and not policy. This gives us a very clear indication of the value system of the members who sit in that Cabinet and we get another set of reasons why we should be careful with pieces of legislation that affect our economy and our rights and freedoms.

Mr. Pinard: You sound scared.

Mr. Hawkes: If that legislation is proposed by a Cabinet that aborts and abandons principles so quickly to get behind the person they think will be the likely winner so that their personal careers can be advanced, then we have, through that action, a clear-cut indication of the value system of those who propose legislation to us.

History tells us, the past four years tell us, that the backbenchers of the Party support blindly, unthinkingly and uncaringly propositions put forward to this House by Cabinet. Liberals are interested in closure because there are flaws in the legislation. If we point them out, they may have to change the legislation.

Mr. Kaplan: Do it in committee.

Mr. Hawkes: With closure the Government will not have to do that. That is why it wants closure. This House should deny the Liberals that closure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this brief debate on Bill C-9. This Bill scares me, not because of the obvious intent at this time on the part of the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), but looking ahead down the road as this Bill is written, more unscrupulous Solicitors General or more unscrupulous Prime Ministers could use this kind of legislation to subvert the Canadian parliamentary system. In a system where we rely a great deal on precedents as well as on written law, I think it behooves every Member in this Chamber today to think twice before he or she votes to support this kind of legislation.

Security Intelligence Service

It is true that every democracy must be vigilant against subversion. We must have a strong security system in the country to maintain our democracy. But we should never subvert democracy in order to maintain democracy. In other words, we should never stoop to use authoritarian methods in order to combat potential authoritarianism.

● (1200)

In Bill C-9 there are three major areas—the proposed mandate for the security service, the powers suggested in the Bill for that civilian security service, and the oversight and accountability section. If we take a look at all three of these areas, we find with respect to the first one, that is the mandate of the security agency, that the language is still too vague, too all-pervasive, and encompasses far too much activity for a secret service in a democracy.

For example, church groups sending funds to the African National Congress or Central American liberation movements could come under subsection (c) and be indicted. Moreover, those who are opposed to the testing of the Cruise missile could be indicted under subsection (b). When we keep in mind that the existing security service within the RCMP presently has over 800,000 files on Canadians, this Bill simply gives the proposed new civilian security service an even greater opportunity to build dossier after dossier on people who are not in fact breaking any law within Canada. I just do not like it. It scares me. It is against all principles of natural justice. It is against all principles of basic democratic rights—the right to dissent, the right to oppose, the right to demonstrate peacefully. Why should we have a secret service hiding behind bushes, shrubs and windows taking pictures of those of us who from time to time feel we should demonstrate peacefully against what we think is wrong in a democracy. I do not like this kind of legislation which we on both sides of the House are expected to accept and pass into law. It is not part of our tradition.

In fact, Bill C-9 and the one before it, Bill C-157, came into being because the old security service within the RCMP was using dirty tricks and was in fact institutionalizing lawbreaking. The McDonald Commission indicated that it had to come to an end. However, that is not what the Bill does. Bill C-9—and the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) knows it—will legitimize or make legal all those dirty tricks and the lawbreaking of which the RCMP was guilty back in the 1970s and for which the government of the day, that is the present Government, refused to accept any political or governmental responsibility. It turned a blind eye to it. On the one hand it let the RCMP do what it wanted to do in the security service. When they were caught, all of a sudden the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said: "I don't know what the hell is going on; they don't report to me". The Solicitor General of the day said: "I don't know what the hell is going on; they don't report to me". The truth of the matter is that the Solicitor General of the day and the present Prime Minister did not want to know what was going on because they would then, in the interests of democracy, have to stand up and say enough is enough. That would mean, of course, that they could not have brought in Bill C-157 legitimizing and making lawful these dirty tricks, and