

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, normally Canadians are said to be rather dull and not politically active. In fact, Canadians have generally been described as being pretty grey. When looking at the legislation which the Government is introducing, an observer from another country or from another planet would surely come to the conclusion that underneath this facade, or this reputation which Canadians have, they must be pretty dangerous animals. They must exist in tremendous turmoil underneath the surface. They must be plotting and they must be active in terrorist organizations. And, they must be concerned with pulling down, by violent means, the state.

The Bill before us treats this country and Canadian people as though subversion is running rampant. We must guard against it. There is a tremendous danger to the security of our lawful form of government which requires a secret police force with tremendous powers so that this widespread subversion can be stamped out. But, it is absurd to assure that Canadians are subversive folk and terrorist people, that we have a tremendous history of subversion and terrorism in this country, and that the Government needs the type of legislation it is presenting to us today.

In this year of our Lord 1984, a year made famous by George Orwell in his book *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, we find being brought to life in the Bill things about which George Orwell warned. Particularly, in the area of definition, we find the thoughts of George Orwell coming to life.

This Bill allows the Government far-reaching powers. The definitions are so loose that practically any political activity that attempts to create some change can be deemed to be against the best interests of Canada and the Canadian Government. Farmers who protest high interest rates and farm bankruptcies; workers involved in strikes or demonstrations; peace activists signing petitions; members of churches involved in raising funds for other countries in which dictatorships of the right or the left might exist; can all be considered, under the broad definition of this legislation as subversive. People can have their telephones tapped, medical files looked into, legal files snooped into, and be subjected to all sorts of activities that would normally be associated with a police state. People who are involved in very legitimate political activities could be subjected to acts which would normally be found in a police state, whether of the right or of the left persuasion.

I mentioned George Orwell earlier because in much of the debate which surrounds Bill C-9, we find Orwellian thoughts being expressed, and the type of double-think about which George Orwell warned. It seems very curious to me that the Government set up the McDonald Commission to look into the alleged illegal activities of the RCMP and to offer some remedies in order that the illegal activities which were being performed against Canadian citizens would not occur in the future. The McDonald Commission went through that long, arduous process, and what was the result? A Bill was introduced by the Government which would legalize the infringements which took place against the individual civil liberties of Canadians. The Government used the excuse of the commis-

### *Security Intelligence Service*

sion to look into attacks on the civil liberties of Canadians. It used the commission as an excuse to legalize those very activities the McDonald Commission was originally set up in an attempt to protect Canadians from. It is Orwellian double-thinking that a government, on the one hand, would introduce a Charter of Rights and be very proud of what it has given to Canadian people—the protection of religious and political freedoms, and the right to express those beliefs—and, on the other hand, take away those rights and freedoms with this Bill.

Unfortunately, our Charter of Rights and Freedoms has a big red ink spot on it. Our national symbol has been spoiled by a misguided person. However, this Bill is a black spot on our Constitution and on our Charter of Rights which is a thousand times more evil than the red spot which exists on that document. This is a black spot which removes the heart and soul of our Constitution and our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The red spot is only a spot of ink on a piece of paper. This legislation ushers in the night—a dark period for Canadians.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the definition clause. My colleagues in the Conservative Party and in the New Democratic Party have expressed over and over again in this House the dangers which exist in the Bill. I am sure the Government, and the Minister responsible, will say the examples we are using are far-fetched, that they are not going to spy on people we are concerned, and perhaps raising money for some cause in El Salvador. Of course, they are not going to start keeping files on people who march in peace demonstrations, or on farmers who use their tractors in blockades as a way of protesting high interest rates and farm bankruptcies. The Government will say these are far-fetched examples.

● (1820)

It might be true, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister and the present Government might not use these powers or interpret these powers in such a wide way. I expect those Hon. Members are honourable and decent people and will not needlessly go out and use what we consider to be illegal activities on their fellow Canadians. I am not certain, however, Mr. Speaker, of their capacity to control those men and women who will be hired to man this organization. I believe the Government and that Minister have a long record of not being quite capable of handling the people they are supposed to be in charge of.

Our view, Mr. Speaker, is that we are creating a monster which is going to have a life of its own and the political masters of that monster are going to be quite incompetent to controlling it, as they have been incompetent in controlling other parts of their bureaucracy. Other parts of their bureaucracy have grown, inflated and achieved a life of their own and have swallowed up their political masters. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we are creating a monster here which is going to be much more fearful than any of the bureaucratic monsters which the Government opposite has created. It is going to create a secret police bureaucratic monster by which numerous individual Canadians are going to be swallowed up, and perhaps destroyed in terms of their individual lives, because that