

large. Bill C-9 is over 50 pages long, covers two separate Acts and amends a dozen other statutes. It is very complex.

Essentially we have opposing interests here—national security versus individual freedoms. The Bill raises the question of why all this has come up in the last few years. I suppose it is primarily because of the FLQ incident in Quebec and the dramatic over-reaction by the government of the day which became alarmed. It got the RCMP to do all sorts of things that it would never have done and had never done because the Government wanted to get the goods. Now the Government is proposing a new Bill because of the actions of a police force that it encouraged to break the law. I do not believe for one second that the high command of the RCMP or individual officers broke that law without the express or implied consent of high government leaders. I believe that might go right to the office of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who told them to get the goods.

Then there was the invocation of the War Measures Act largely as a result of barn burning and break-ins done by the actual agents, the national police force, under the political influence of the government of the day. It is an absolutely absurd situation and it is very, very dangerous. That is why I said in my first speech on Bill C-157 that the essential problem is that people do not trust the Liberal Government today, nor have they since it came into office in 1968. That is for very good reason, Mr. Speaker. That is why I said that people did have an essential trust of Prime Minister St. Laurent and of John Diefenbaker, because those gentlemen demonstrated that they would never play fast and easy with the deeply held emotions of Canadians.

That is essentially what Manitoba is today—a Premier and Parties that are prepared to play fast and easy with deeply held feelings. That is what Lebanon is. That is what Northern Ireland is. Extremist groups are formed, governments take extreme positions on issues and then oppositions are forced to take extreme positions. You must be very sensitive when playing around with issues that you can say rationally should be A, B or C. Ordinary Canadians feel strongly about some of these things and we have to be sensitive to them.

When it comes to a question of national security versus individual freedoms, Mr. Speaker, no one doubts in these modern times that we must have a national security service. That is not the issue. We have one now in the RCMP. The question is what are the sufficient checks and balances to individual freedoms. We have just entrenched a lovely, well-worded Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but it is not worth the powder to blow it apart if it is not respected in the practice of the Government. From time to time we all use the example of the Soviet Union, which has a fine written charter of human rights but it is not worth anything because of the way the law is administered and abused there. That is what Canadians feel about this Government and that is why they are going to put it out of office. They cannot trust it and with very good reason.

The underlying principle that we need more debate on is: How we can maintain free debate and discussion in society in the face of what the Bill states will occur, which is secret

Security Intelligence Service

investigations and record-keeping on people? The very fact I am nervous that if I telephone my friend the conversation might be picked up, or that if I go out to a public meeting someone from the security service may be making notes and putting the information on file, restricts my feeling of freedom to discuss the issues frankly. When the issues are not discussed frankly that is when society and democracy as we know it goes down the tube.

Our friends in the NDP say members of this Party are not rising to speak in the debate, but we are rising because we feel strongly about this matter. We want them to rise because we want to know what they feel. Why are members of the Government not rising to answer my question about these investigative measures and the record-keeping that make us feel so uneasy that we do not discuss the issues frankly and fully? That is the question I am anxious to hear government Members address.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak about this legislation which I consider to be very dangerous. That is not because I disagree with the need for a security force to counteract terrorism or the actions of legitimate subversives. However, I believe this legislation grants a blank cheque to a security service which would be able to continue the present practice of infringing the rights of many Canadians.

Although members of the Conservative Party have spoken, they have not done so in proportion to their numbers in this House. For every member of the New Democratic Party who speaks, only one Conservative speaks, yet they have three times as many Members as this Party has in the House. I am not surprised by that attitude. They complain that the Bill is facing closure yet they do not put up many speakers. There is a basic contradiction in that approach.

Speaking about Bill C-157, the previous Bill which was similar to the one before us, Elmer MacKay, the former Member for Central Nova who now occupies a high policy advisory role in the office of the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney), said that there are too many civil liberty safeguards in the present legislation. This was the view of someone who now sits in the office of the Leader of the Conservative Party, someone who is advising the Conservative Party on policy. It is no wonder that members of that Party are not getting up to speak and that they are quietly approving the legislation.

I should like to contrast that with the remarks of Alan Borovoy, the general counsel of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, who said about the legislation that the powers of intrusive surveillance are needlessly broad. Under the terms of this Bill as it is now formulated, Canadian citizens could have their conversations bugged, their mail opened, their homes searched and their confidential records invaded, even though there is not the slightest suggestion of any lawbreaking involved.