

Security Intelligence Service

able to do, they have no trouble at all dealing with foreign KGB agents, foreign espionage, foreign countries and people who come into Canada to subvert our country. However, when we are talking about our own citizens who want to support groups in other countries through their church groups, and who want to be able to join marches, whether it is anti-Cruise or whatever, or speak out against the Crow legislation, they want to be able to do that without feeling intimidated. Clause 2(d) is written so widely that even church groups will be very nervous in what they do. The effect of that is to cast a chilling climate of fear and apprehension. It is a form of intimidation.

When I spoke with the Western Canada Concept group and tried to convince them that this country was worth saving, that in itself would have been sufficient to be classified as domestic subversion. Under the wording "intended ultimately" to hurt this country, the security service could target me and put on extra special surveillance. They could intercept my mail, telephone conversations and put tails on me. Those are intimidating acts for Members of Parliament. We all speak with groups every day. We were trying to narrow the definition of that clause in order to eliminate the chilling effect and the potential intimidation.

I will speak to each of these clauses individually as they arise. However, over-all I would say that I am concerned. I hope that as a result of the mindless obstructionism and opposition of the NDP, the Government does not over-react and move time allocation before there has been an opportunity to discuss half a dozen of the major issues upon which Canadians want to express their views. I also hope that Canadians will receive a response.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that this legislation is before us in such a destructive form. However, I am happy to speak against Bill C-9. I notice that the previous speaker was frightened that, by some magic he did not explain, a few NDP speakers would prevent the Conservative speakers, who have three times as many chances as we do to speak, from making their points. I notice that they have not fully used their opportunity this morning, so I will proceed instead of one of them.

The previous speaker also made a very sensible point.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know why the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) would say that the Conservative Party has not fully used its opportunity this morning. We have spoken just as much as, if not more than, any other Party in the House. The fact that we extend to the NDP the courtesy to speak after two Conservative speakers in a row does not warrant his comment. The innuendo is that we are not seriously taking part in this debate. I do not think it advances his cause or anyone else's cause and I resent it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): May I suggest that the remarks which have been made by both hon. gentlemen have little to do with procedure or manner of debate. Of

course, what one Member says may not please another Member, but there is little the Chair can do in that case.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I will continue with debate as I was doing legitimately, not illegitimately as was the previous speaker under the pretence of a point of order. The point which I was making when I was cut off by that frivolous point of order was that the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) made a good and valid point when he spoke about the great uneasiness of the churches in Canada over the likely effects of this Bill in its present form.

One of the major church congregations in the riding of Spadina, which I represent, has in fact commented on this very forcefully through a publication entitled *Bloor Street Leap*. It is a publication of the Outreach Committee of the Bloor Street United Church. They are very, very gravely concerned about the affect of the Bill. They suggest a possible scenario which could perhaps take place any time after this week if the Government succeeds in driving this Bill through the House.

For example, they suggest that if the World Outreach Committee of the Bloor Street United Church was pursuing its normal concern for refugees from Latin America, it might find the following scenario. The committee votes to give a sum of money to a relief organization in El Salvador. Suddenly one day it is visited by people who identify themselves as agents of the CSIS, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. Its representatives are quizzed about why the organization is sending money to El Salvador. They are asked if it is sympathetic to rebels who are against the Government of El Salvador. They are also asked if it is perhaps opposed to the democratic process, which some members of the Canadian Government and some members of the Official Opposition think is represented by the present Government of El Salvador.

The term "political subversion" is thrown around. The Outreach Committee could be told by an agent "We've been watching you". As the previous speaker implied, that would be quite a shock to members of any church congregation in Canada. Under the circumstances, the Outreach Committee would assume that it was engaged in a lawful and humanitarian action. However, now that action may well be judged as being a threat against the security of Canada.

What the Committee is saying on the basis of its study of the Bill, which has been guided by a brief prepared and presented by the Canadian Council of Churches to the parliamentary committee and which was made available throughout the church, is that it considers that to be a realistic scenario which the Bill could possibly effect upon the religious activities of its congregation.

The Outreach Committee pointed out the vagueness of the definition of a security threat 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—

It is very, very concerned about the vague wording of that clause. The United Church of Canada has activities in many