

*Security Intelligence Service*

One of the things which we must consider is the extraordinary ruling by the chairman of the committee. He indicated that he would resign, following the process which was undertaken in relation to Bill C-9, in order to avoid the future work of that committee being tainted by the processes which were undertaken by himself and by the Government. Why the unseemly haste? They are willing to throw all traditions and all regular workings aside. They admit themselves that what they are undertaking with this Bill has very serious implications. They are using a ramrod and a railroad in attempting to push the legislation through committee and through the House more than is normal for many of the pieces of legislation which have a much higher priority rating with the people of Canada.

This is essentially the same Government that in 1970 thought that four kids with guns who ran around in a car meant a state of apprehended insurrection. Someone was murdered, but murders are committed every month in this country. However, when four kids with guns ran around in a car it was considered to be a state of revolution and enough to suspend civil liberties for hundreds, thousands and millions of Canadians. What kind of confidence does that give us in the way the Government will interpret its enforcement, and its agencies' enforcement of this Act? Perhaps we should be asking, Mr. Speaker, what the state of mind is of its new Prime Minister designate? Does John Turner agree with those people across the way who are setting up a separate spy agency, a separate security intelligence agency in Bill C-9, which has a greater priority than the passage, for instance, of Bill C-34, which could help to protect the lives and livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of working Canadians? What is his priority? Is spying more important than workers' lives? Is that the priority of the new Prime Minister designate? We ought to ask him that question and let him make the choice. These people, that Minister and other Ministers, may not be around very long for one reason or another, and before we are asked to do something as extraordinary as pursuing this kind of agency, particularly with the very broad and dangerous generalizations which are included in this particular clause, we ought to ask ourselves what the priority is of this government and what is its state of mind. Is justice more important than spying on fellow Canadians? Just where does the Government stand? I hope that one of those Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, will answer.

● (1350)

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on Motion No. 2 which moves to delete Clause 2 of this Bill. In this connection, I would like to say a word of appreciation to the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) for his effort. All the members of our caucus have greatly appreciated the hard and dedicated work which has been done. We appreciate the plaudit of the justice critic of the Tory Party. If he had been a little more active, we would perhaps have seen some more changes brought in which are necessary. However, we do appreciate the work of the Hon. Member for Burnaby.

In moving to delete Clause 2 we are especially concerned about the definition of "threats to the security of Canada". As had been remarked, not only by different Hon. Members speaking in this Chamber but by many of the witnesses who have appeared before the committee, these definitions are much too broad and loose. That broadness and looseness constitutes a very real danger to the civil liberties of the people of Canada. That is why we are opposed to this Bill. Really, when one looks at these definitions, one sees the way in which this Bill opens up to abuse by the proposed civilian security service the basic rights and freedoms which Canadians had taken for granted until the 1970s when the extent to which these rights had been subverted by members of the security service of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were revealed. When we look at the definition of "threats to the security of Canada", we should pay special attention to the definition in paragraph (b) which states:

... 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, ...

The phrase, Mr. Speaker, "... detrimental to the interests of Canada ..." is a very vague phrase. We would be interested in knowing just precisely what the Government means by it. Does it mean, for example, someone who opposes the sale of Candu nuclear reactors to other countries? Certainly this Government has planned a fair amount of its economic program on the sale of those reactors. Because it has been such a flop, this Government has suffered. Would opposition to the sale of those reactors be detrimental to the interests of Canada? In my previous work, Mr. Speaker, as clergyman with the United Church of Canada, I was very active in such movements as "Ten Days for World Development", which was concerned with the needs of people in Third World countries and the kinds of oppression which are faced by many of those people. There is concern expressed by the Canadian Council of Churches about the way in which this proposed definition can affect that kind of work within my church and within other churches. In the brief submitted by the Canadian Council of Churches, it is stated:

With regard to section 2(a) and (b) we are concerned with the vague phrase "the interests of Canada". What are the legitimate "interests of Canada"? Who defines these "interests"? Are the "interests of Canada" distinguishable from the interests of the citizens of Canada? Could there be a legitimate conflict among the citizens of Canada as to just what Canada's "interests" are?

With regard to paragraph (b) for example: consider that a visiting foreign finance minister, from a country where churches have carried on mission work for many years, requests a private meeting with Canadian church officials, in Canada, to discuss Canadian aid and trade policies. He wishes to decrease his country's dependence on Canadian exports, while maintaining or increasing Canadian aid to his country. He enlists the assistance and advice of his Canadian friends. This meeting could be construed as "foreign-influenced", given long relations between his government and church agencies in his country and with Canadian churches. It may be "detrimental to the interests of Canada" if its objective is decreasing Canadian sales in his country. Because the meeting is private and confidential it could fall within the definition of "clandestine", there being no definition of that term within Bill C-9 itself. Presumably the meeting might also be "deceptive", for instance if the visitor had told Canadian state officials that he wished to meet with the churches to discuss the construction of a church-sponsored hospital. The activity is clearly "within Canada". Even though we would understand this meeting to be a lawful activity, the participants are potentially targets for surveillance by the Security Service.