

Security Intelligence Service

that I was importing what appeared to be opium from China. I asked why they would think that. They said there was another package in customs for me from China and they were very concerned about it because they notice it had something to do with opium. I suggested we go down again and have a look. We went to the customs office and found that I had written to an educational institution in China for some books about the opium wars. They had sent me half a dozen books explaining various interpretations of the opium wars. This again had led the RCMP to do an intensive search on this obvious importing of some peculiar documents.

From a personal point of view, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about what this legislation does and does not do. It is certainly going to result in a great deal more electronic eavesdropping. Canada is now somewhat famous for the amount of electronic eavesdropping which goes on, particularly compared to the United States. It will also allow the tapping of telephones to play a major role in surveillance activities. This legislation will give the government agency the right to tap an individual's phone virtually forever if he is on a list of questionable individuals. This is the kind of blanket eavesdropping and intrusion into the lives of individual Canadians which we must speak out against. We must introduce amendments to this Bill to ensure this does not take place in these massive and sweeping dimensions.

We unquestionably oppose the Bill as it is written, but will be doing everything possible to make it a better Bill once it gets to committee. We are looking forward to moving with some haste to an early clause by clause review in committee.

[Translation]

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, Friday morning, the Member for La Prairie (Mr. Deniger) was the first to speak. At the beginning of his speech he said, and I quote:

With this Bill, we want to give Canadian citizens the assurance that their individual rights and freedoms will be respected.

He said these words at the beginning of his speech. However, at the end of his speech, he moved the following motion, seconded by the Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans):

That this question be now put.

Mr. Speaker, these two sentences are at odds with each other.

[English]

We have a Member of Parliament who stands in this Chamber and begins his speech by talking about the importance of a law because it respects the rights and liberties of Canadians. He concludes that intervention with a motion for closure in this House, to deny the Members of the House, the elected representatives of the people, the right to express the opinions of their constituents. We have a contradiction in that one speech. That should indicate to all Canadians the continuing concern they should have about the conduct of the Liberal Government and the members of Liberal Party. They stand in this Chamber and tell us we have a piece of legislation which

the Liberals thought through carefully and brought through the Senate, a piece of legislation that is important to our rights and liberties. For the Liberals to tell us that we should be prepared to support a motion which denies the elected Members of this Chamber the right to speak to this Bill is to tell us through their actions that one cannot believe what they say.

• (1150)

Canadians remember that this is a Party that said 90 days of wage and price controls was a bad idea. Once Canadians elected the Liberals, they gave us three years of wage and price controls. Canadians remember that the Liberal Party is a Party that said an 18 cents a gallon increase in gasoline was too much and four years later the increase is a dollar or very close to it. Canadians should pay attention to the fact that the Government's primary spokesman started by telling us that this legislation was important to our rights and liberties, and that same Member, the Hon. Member for La Prairie, concluded his remarks with an action designed to deny the Members of this House those rights, to deny Canadians the liberty which flows from freedom of speech.

This is a government that should have called an election a month ago. This is a government whose mandate in terms of all Canadian traditions expired a month ago. It is time to allow the Canadian people to decide who should govern this country for the next four years. The Liberal Party instead has decided to cling to power for as long as possible. This Government will have us believe that it has a leadership contest in place with a bunch of new ideas coming down the pipe. The one declared candidate for that leadership who does not presently sit in this Chamber is the person who, when he did sit in this Chamber, started us on the borrowing path. In good times this man of courage borrowed money to bribe voters. That worked in 1974, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kaplan: What has that got to do with the security service?

Mr. Hawkes: We pay the price in 1984. The Minister asks what that has got to do with the security legislation. It has a great deal to do with the security legislation because the biggest difficulty with this piece of legislation is that it is sponsored by a government that nobody trusts.

Mr. Stewart: Exactly.

Mr. Hawkes: This legislation is sponsored by a government that has no mandate. It is sponsored by a government that is dealing with our rights and freedoms and nobody trusts it to do it with fairness, justice or equity. The record shows that this is the Government and the Party that attempted to alter the fundamental law of this land, the Constitution of this country, without prior consultation, with a new assertion. Within two weeks of debate we faced closure. After three days of debate on the security legislation we are facing closure again.

This is a government that consistently attempts to deny Canadians the right to speak freely, to speak assertively and to speak at length when necessary. In that kind of an atmosphere,