

Security Intelligence Service

Government opposite cannot control the people of whom it is supposed to be the political master.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired.

Mr. de Jong: I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to continue for a few more minutes to complete my remarks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member time to continue his remarks?

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on Bill C-9 I cannot but help think that the measures proposed in this Bill by the Minister and by the Government are probably more in line with that old medical maxim that "cure is more dangerous than the disease".

I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, I have probably had more letters from constituents and concerned Canadians about this Bill than I have received about any other piece of legislation I have had to deal with in this House since I came here, and it is little wonder. The Minister himself has been required to attempt to justify the provisions of this Bill to a greater extent than any other Minister, of which I am aware, in dealing with any other piece of legislation in this House. It is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, when one takes a look at the press interpretations of how this Bill would be applied and how it could be interpreted in the future once it passes through this House.

Let me give an example of the way the press has described, not only what is contained in the Bill but what the Minister has said about how the Bill could be implemented, and that certainly gives me great concern. I believe the same concern is shared by constituents across the country who have written to me and other Hon. Members. For example, in the *Montreal Gazette* on May 30, 1983, the headline reads, "Kaplan warns the Peace Movement could be probed". *The Globe and Mail* on May 10 stated, "A New Security Agency can Break the Law". The headline on the *Vancouver Sun* on May 24 reads, "A Shocking Bit of Business". It goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, as I read those headlines myself, before I had the opportunity to go through the Bill to any great extent, I wondered what the Minister and the Government were trying to do in terms of the civil rights and liberties of the citizens of this country.

I have several letters here I am sure would be of interest to the Minister, because I believe they adequately express the sentiments of a cross-section of people who have written to me. I will read one from—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member. However, I should remind the Hon. Member that we are now debating Motions Nos. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 which have been grouped for debate. It would be helpful to the Chair, as is the practice in the House, that when Hon. Members rise to

speak on debate they perhaps indicate to the Chair what motions they are directing their remarks to. In that way the Chair would be in a position to evaluate whether or not the Hon. Member's remarks are relevant to the motion.

I have been listening attentively to the Hon. Member who now has the floor. His comments really are of a general nature. He is quoting newspaper articles and letters. That is hardly, I must say, pertinent to motions, most of whose objects are to delete clauses, and one which strives to modify certain articles. I would invite the Hon. Member, therefore, to be more pertinent to the motions now before the House, if he would please do so.

Mr. Young: Thank you for your intervention, Mr. Speaker. I was addressing the concerns which people have about Clause 2, the definition of "threats to the security of Canada", and how the Government and the new security service could be inclined to interpret that particular Clause of the Bill. I certainly was speaking in a general sense, because my constituents, generally speaking, are not lawyers. They do not understand the legal interpretations which may be given strictly to these Clauses of the Bill with which we are concerned. However, I thought it important that the Minister, and Hon. Members in the House, understood the general concerns about the direction in which the Government may or may not go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair, of course, has no intention whatsoever—and it is not permissible—to debate with the Hon. Member or to participate in the debate. However, the Hon. Member is surely knowledgeable of the process of passing legislation in the House. There are circumstances in which the Hon. Member may make comments of a general nature regarding the principles of a bill and to the contents of other clauses. I must ask the Hon. Member to be relevant and pertinent, and speak strictly to the motions now before the House. I am sure I will have his support in that objective.

Mr. Young: Unfailing support, Mr. Speaker. Clause 2 of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides the definition of "threats to the security of Canada" as follows:

(a) espionage or sabotage that is against Canada or is detrimental to the interests of Canada or activities directed toward or in support of such espionage or sabotage, . . .

Or:

(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, . . .

Again, Mr. Speaker, it would include:

(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 achieving a political objective within Canada or a foreign state—

● (1830)

It also included activities directed toward undermining by covert and unlawful acts or directed toward or intended ultimately to lead to the destruction or overthrow by violence of the constitutionally established government in Canada, but it