

assume more of the responsibilities for its actions. This means a reduction in the power of the Government over the House of Commons, or the Government in relation to the House of Commons. However, I think quite frankly that that is a good thing. I think it is a good thing that the House of Commons be seen to be taking more responsibility for its own actions, and that Members of Parliament as individuals be seen to play a greater role in Parliament. I would like to see these changes take place.

● (1800)

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE ACT

#### MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-9, an Act to establish the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, to enact an Act respecting enforcement in relation to certain security and related offences and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof or in relation thereto, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and Motion No. 2 (Mr. Robinson (Burnaby)), Motion No. 5 (Mr. Allmand), and motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 (Mr. Robinson (Burnaby)).

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to make a ruling on the point of order that is outstanding with regard to Bill C-9. I would like to thank Hon. Members for their contributions to the consideration of the admissibility of Motions Nos. 93 and 94. The Chair has given serious consideration to the argument with respect to the review committee's powers. I still have serious reservations about the admissibility of these motions because they appear to go beyond the scope of the Bill as agreed to at second reading. Nevertheless, the contributions of Hon. Members were sufficiently persuasive that I am prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt.

Accordingly, Motions Nos. 93 and 94 will be grouped with Motions Nos. 95, 96 and 97 for debate and shall be voted on separately.

Before Private Members' Hour began, the House was considering the report stage of Bill C-9. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) had the floor. I now recognize the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald).

**Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I regret very much having to take part in yet another debate on the security legislation which is before us. It is a very monstrous piece of legislation and one which threatens

the security of Canadians in the guise of attempting to protect the security of Canadians.

I would like to deal with this all-embracing, ill-defined, enormously mistaken and ill-thought-out part of the legislation which contains the definition of the words "threats to the security of Canada". Such threats have been far too broadly defined. The legislation is wobbly. It is not careful and it is not precise. Its result is that normal, law-abiding people who pose not threat at all to the security of Canada can be targeted for all means of surveillance.

Let us look at what is stated in the legislation. Under the subtitle "Duties and Functions of Service", Clause 12 of the Bill reads as follows:

The Service shall collect, by investigation or otherwise, to the extent that it is strictly necessary, and analyse and retain information and intelligence respecting activities that may on reasonable grounds be suspected of constituting threats to the security of Canada—

Turning to the definitions clause which is Clause 2, the relevant portion of that clause reads as follows:

"threats to the security of Canada" means

(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,—

I note, however, that espionage and sabotage are not themselves defined and that the interests of Canada are not defined. They could include economic interests or any number of interests apart from vital issues of national security. Paragraph (b) of the relevant portion of Clause 2 reads as follows:

—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,—

Does that mean any one person? What does clandestine or deceptive mean? It is not defined. "Foreign influenced" is a very, very broad expression that could involve people belonging to international organizations. Paragraph (c) reads:

—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—

Note how broad that is. It does not include only threats to life and physical security but also threats to property. These could be trivial threats to property as well as serious ones. The paragraph continues:

—for the purpose of achieving a political objective within Canada or a foreign state,—

Again, this includes the whole world and any kind of political objective, even though it may be a very legitimate one. Paragraph (d) reads:

—activities directed toward undermining by covert unlawful acts, or directed toward or intended ultimately—

And "ultimately" is a word that we might well dwell upon.

—to lead to the destruction or overthrow by violence of, the constitutionally established system of government in Canada,—

There follows a paragraph which exempts people who are engaged in lawful dissent or lawful political protest but, contrary to the wild, woolly and broad definitions under "threats to security," the exemptions are very narrowly defined. This paragraph reads: