

intended ultimately to overthrow the constitutionally established system of government.

Mr. Evans: You leave out the words "by violence".

Mr. Thacker: It says "intended ultimately to lead to the destruction or"—

Mr. Evans: "Or overthrow by violence."

Mr. Thacker: It can be "either or". It is not "and".

Mr. Evans: The destruction or overthrow by violence, either one by violence.

Mr. Thacker: Either one, that is the point. By taking a broad definition, the agency could interpret that to be the destruction but not by violence. If the clause read "toward the destruction and overthrow", then both tests would have to be met before that clause could be triggered. Once the agency triggers the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans), for example, because he spoke to a group that the agency believes ultimately intends to get at our way of life, it can intercept his first-class mail, instal telephone taps and remove his medical files and legal documents even though it is his private business. There can be a massive investigation of his personal life because he gave a speech to or went to a rally of a group that, in the opinion of the security service, ultimately intends to overthrow or destroy by violence the Government.

That clause is simply worded wrongly. I sat on the committee. I listened to those 25 witnesses and read over 50 briefs which were presented by people like Mr. Borovoy of the Civil Rights League of Canada and the lawyers who appeared. Many legitimate groups said that this wording is too broad in the Canadian tradition of freedoms. Consequently, they proposed amendments to it. They have proposed amendments that reduce the ability of the security service to go after our own people. This clause is not designed to go after others because that is provided for in the other clauses. This clause is designed to go after our own citizens. We all feel the shame of what we did to the Japanese-Canadians. They were Canadians whom our own Government uprooted, removed their property and never adequately compensated. Today, in 1984, the Liberal Cabinet is insisting on a wording that would permit the same type of attacks on our own people. We do not have a history of subversion that justifies that at all.

The Government's own member, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand), is a former Solicitor General in the Liberal Cabinet who knows what it is like from the inside. He has said that the wording is wrong and has put down an amendment that is very reasonable. Yet the Cabinet has rejected a proposed amendment from a former Solicitor General of its own Government. There is something wrong.

The Government is insisting on this wording even though it is too broad. This wording has been rejected by witnesses. A proposal for change has been made by the former Solicitor General. I just do not understand why the present Solicitor

Security Intelligence Service

General and the Cabinet would not accept an amendment to Clause 2(d) which attempts to go after our own people. It is an intimidating clause. How will I, as a Member of Parliament, be free to talk to groups when I know that this clause will allow someone in the security agency to single me out and I could be subjected for years to investigation and intrusive techniques on my life? It is wrong and the clause must be defeated.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on this Bill at second reading, I tried to emphasize our concern about the need to have narrowly defined definitions. If we are going to talk about security, we had better define it very carefully. I have wondered since that debate why it is that the Government has so much inertia, so little willingness to listen to any kind of change that might narrow that definition. It suddenly dawned on me that possibly one of the reasons the Government does not want changes is that it does not understand the genuine concern and fear that exists on the Opposition benches. It does not understand it, though not because it does not want to. When you look at the Government benches there are so few Members who represent the multicultural community and therefore have no input that would allow them to understand this kind of fear.

● (1600)

I can tell you that within this caucus there are numbers upon numbers of Members who come from a multicultural community who either themselves or their relatives have experienced a police state that gives them a genuine concern for and fear of this kind of legislation. They have faced this kind of insecurity. When I look at my colleagues who have come from Eastern or Western Europe and who have faced this kind of situation where any kind of definition can be changed to suit a situation at the whim of an official, I know there is cause for genuine fear.

Members of the Government do not understand the sincerity of our concern regarding this aspect of the legislation. It is impossible for them because neither they nor their families have experienced such a situation. When we live in times of real calm in Canada, when we are at peace, when there is no social upheaval or international upheaval that touches our borders, it is understandable they do not really appreciate what we are talking about.

In the seven or eight minutes left to me I want to remind Members opposite of four experiences which they should be able to recall that underscore why we are worried. First is World War II and the climate of fear that existed in Canada on the part of those who did not come from United Kingdom stock but who came from European or Oriental stock. Let me remind Hon. Members that it was the Liberal Party in 1939 or 1940, when it wanted to criticize the CCF, as it was at that time, and Mr. Woodsworth's defence of the Orientals, that put ads in the paper reading: "Vote socialist and you bring in the yellow peril". That is what the Liberals were advertising in those years. That was done because of the emotional charge at