

these circumstances. If there was a House order for a vote at 5.45 today or at 9.45 today, in those circumstances that Standing Order may be appropriate. However, it is under no circumstances applicable in these circumstances. I respectfully submit that Your Honour reconsider and recognize that there is Government business before the House and that it is the right of any Member to protest the arrogance of this Government in moving closure on such an important Bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Order, please. I was prepared to listen to the Hon. Member presenting an argument until he started debating another issue. I would refer him to Standing Order 9(1) which provides that:

On the tenth sitting day preceding June 30 a motion to extend the hours of sitting to a specific hour during the last ten sitting days may be proposed, without notice, by any Member during routine proceedings.

I refer the Hon. Member to the proceedings of this House on Thursday, June 14, where in unanimous consent was given to a motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard). As a result, I am afraid my ruling stands and a motion cannot be accepted.

For continuing debate, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West):** Mr. Speaker, we are now dealing with provisions of this legislation dealing with the definition of national security in Canada. I had the privilege of representing my Party for a period of time as critic with respect to this legislation. We had a very full debate and a number of representations were made to us by people across this country which I think were fairly consistent. These were not a group of lunatics or people who were unduly concerned or a little crazy. These were eminently sensible, outstanding citizens of our country who made a consistent plea to us as Members dealing with this legislation.

● (1540)

The plea which we as Members of Parliament received was that there was great concern and apprehension over the broad definition of what constituted a threat to national security under this legislation. I will give an example of what I am talking about. Under this legislation, if you are found to have supported movements and groups outside of Canada which advocate the overthrow of established governments in other countries, you become a target for the civilian security agency to spy upon. There is no question that at first blush that does not sound like an unreasonable proposition. There are some groups which I do not think 99 per cent of Canadians would want to be associated with which do support the violent overthrow of some legitimate foreign government.

It has been pointed out to the Government time and again that there are some very legitimate concerns. Sometimes there is an element of violence involved. However, sometimes this is the only recourse for people who live under oppression in countries which are not democratic. Are we going to say that the people who support Solidarity in Poland should become a target of our new security service? That is an outrageous

### *Security Intelligence Service*

proposal for any of us. It is outrageous to say that those of us who support freedom against tyranny and oppression should become legitimate subjects of our new spy service. If that is common sense and logic, and if that will be the result of this legislation, where are we headed in Canada?

I would have thought that after the Liberals had a chance to consider the leadership of their Party this issue would have been defined and articulated. The Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) was one of the leading supporters of Mr. John Turner. I assume when the Solicitor General takes a position on this legislation that he reflects and advises Mr. Turner as to the position the Government is going to continue to take with respect to the legislation. He is a spokesman for John Turner, the future Prime Minister, with respect to this legislation.

I asked the Government House Leader today whether the legislative priorities were going to continue. He said that nothing has changed. The Government House Leader said that Mr. Turner is the new leader and everything that is going on in this institution is okay with him. We had hoped that the matter of civil liberties, the freedom of people in Canada to conduct their affairs without being spied upon by this new civilian intelligence agency, would have been an important issue to Liberals and to Mr. Turner. Where does he stand? He is cheek by jowl with the Solicitor General. He believes the Solicitor General is right. One of his leading supporters and organizers is now, by this definition of "threats to national security", imposing one of the most serious threats to Canadians in any legislation which has been passed during my parliamentary experience, which extends back some 10 years.

As parliamentarians we ask ourselves how any government comes to the conclusion that it is going to open up an agency to spy upon people who have legitimate concerns about the freedoms of people in other countries. Under this legislation the Government is able to unleash enormous capacity to spy on everything done by individuals, groups and agencies which may in fact support the Sandinista movement. There is violence involved there. What about Central America? What about the Afghan rebels? Is anyone in this House prepared to stand in their place and say that anyone who supports the Afghan rebels should be the subject and target of the secret service in this country? It is preposterous even to suggest that.

We brought in amendments. Unfortunately the Speaker saw fit to disallow them because of a procedural fluke. The Speaker said that this is a substantive amendment to a definition section. We have been prohibited by the Speaker from bringing in amendments to tighten up the definition of threats to national security. Our last resort is to support a motion which deletes this provision and opens up the question of redefining threats to national security. That is the serious matter we have before us now.

I know the kind of advice that people in the Government get from their bureaucrats. That say that they need a certain flexibility in the operation of a security service. That kind of advice is for self-protection. The transition team is most interested in not having too many constraints placed upon it. It wants a broad scope and mandate under which to operate.