

country on whom we must keep files? Is that what it believes the Canadian people are all about?

Why does it want more power? Why does it want to legalize opening mail, taping telephones and obtaining medical records and legal records? Why does it want to infringe on the basic democratic rights of Canadian citizens? It would do this without having a parliamentary overview committee which would have the power to police the police.

The Bill is flawed in many ways. It is a danger to the democratic process and to our rights as Canadians. It does not have the types of checks and balances that one finds in the American system. It does not have a parliamentary overview to make certain that the secret police do not get out of hand and become involved in their own web of paranoia which can damage the social fabric.

The Government seems to be afraid of making the secret police accountable to Members of Parliament. It seems to fear its own shadows. As such, we cannot but go on to one course of action, that is, to attempt, with every conceivable tool that the Opposition has, to stop this legislation. As the third Party, we do not have too many tools, but whatever tools we have we will use to stop this piece of legislation. We know that if this piece of legislation is allowed to pass, it can ultimately endanger Canadian society more than any foreign enemy of this country. It is a greater danger to our way of life as we know and cherish it than any foreign agent can be. As such, we will stand opposed, opposed and opposed.

Mr. Pinard: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Point of order.

Mr. Pinard: I am already recognized on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have already recognized the Hon. President of the Privy Council on a point of order.

M. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if my colleague has something important and serious to say, I may just allow him to speak first. I just wanted to know if the hon. gentleman who just finished his speech was speaking in the name of his Party when he promised to do whatever he could to delay and prevent this Bill from being passed in the House. This is a very serious threat of a pure filibuster that is unacceptable.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thought the Hon. President of the Privy Council was rising on a bona fide point of order. However, he rose to put a question, rhetorical or otherwise. A question can only be allowed at this time by unanimous consent, because the time allotted to the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) had expired. Therefore, I will ask if there is unanimous consent to allow the President of the Privy Council to put his question. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Security Intelligence Service

Mr. Pinard: Were you speaking for your Party or not?

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I understand that I do have unlimited time to answer the question by the Hon. Member. It is a very serious question that the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should make it very clear at this time that, contrary to what he may think, the Hon. Member does not have unlimited time to answer the question. The Chair will allow him reasonable time to answer the question. That is the Chair's discretion.

Mr. de Jong: It is an important question that has been asked. We in this Party are very much opposed to the Bill as it stands. We do not state that there is no need for a security service. We believe that there is such a need. However, we believe that major changes to the Act must take place in order to create that balance which will, on the one hand, provide the safety and security of Canadians that can be guaranteed by an effective security system while, on the other hand, the freedoms and rights and liberties of Canadians are guaranteed and not endangered.

We feel that this piece of legislation is so important that the very fabric of Canadian society is threatened by what we have in front of us. Therefore, we will use all means at our disposal—and they are limited because the major opposition Party has many more tools than us—to change the legislation. We will do whatever we can, Mr. Speaker, to introduce legislation, to discuss the amendments, and to convince the Government to sit down and reach a consensus among all Parties in this House, among all segments in Canadian society including university teachers, the churches, the provincial attorneys general and the Canadian Civil Liberties Union. We must achieve that consensus so that we can have a piece of legislation that, on the one hand, will protect Canadian citizens and our way of life, and yet, on the other hand, make certain that our democratic freedoms and our individual rights are not threatened by some cloak-and-dagger concoction which this Government or its successors will have at their disposal. I hope this answers in full the question that was put to me.

• (1630)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Debate. Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Red Deer.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, certainly this day can be referred to as Black Thursday.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Towers: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the "Ohs" come across from the other side. It is they who have little regard for the freedom of the Canadian people. Members on the other side disregard that completely. This is what we are talking about, Mr.