

Legal Assistance

Canada, but it is open-ended so that it provides the Government of Canada with the authority to enter into a treaty to allow another country to enter Canada to carry out police investigations or various other kinds of law-enforcement investigations without ever coming to Parliament for authorization. In a rather extreme case, that would mean that if the Government of Canada wished, it could enter into negotiations with the military junta in Chile and allow the Chilean national police to infiltrate organizations in Canada. That is an extreme example, but it makes the case that the Chilean security forces would be allowed to operate in Canada. That would of course pose a very serious threat to the freedom and well-being of people who have fled the oppressive military regime there and found sanctuary in Canada.

● (1550)

The Bill would allow that regime or any other tinpot dictatorship to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada without scrutiny, monitoring or even the knowledge of Parliament until after the fact. I do not think that is in the best interests of Canadian security or our concern for those who have fled oppressive regimes. If we are talking only about the United States, then let the legislation express it as being the U.S. and limit it to that country.

Someone might say, if it were only the U.S., would we have any concerns? Yes, we would. You will recall a number of occasions when decent law-abiding Canadian citizens have attempted to enter the U.S., or in some cases simply pass through, and have been turned back. Who are some of these people? I just want to give a couple of examples to indicate how oppressive American law can be when it is applied in cases like this.

You will recall that back in 1985 a Canadian was denied entry to the U.S. This incident received a fair bit of publicity at the time. This dangerous person was none other than Farley Mowat, the famous Canadian author.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): I got him in, Nelson.

Mr. Riis: The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) says he got him in. We appreciate that intervention, but the point is that the U.S. deemed this man to be dangerous. All he wanted to do was to go down to the U.S. and promote his most recent book. Why was he denied entry? I remember speaking with him a few days later at a function here on the Hill. He was still kind of leaping with delight at the fact he had caused so much concern to the American authorities. Apparently he had at one time threatened to shoot down some American bombers with his .22 rifle. He had had enough of their invading our airspace and he was going to take some steps himself and take on the United States' Strategic Air Command.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Did his book sales go up?

Mr. Riis: I suppose they might have increased as a result of this publicity. Knowing Farley Mowat, he would have taken

advantage of this rather peculiar event at the American border.

It is peculiar that we would not be concerned about that kind of situation and have taken steps to negotiate with the U.S. so that this kind of silliness does not occur.

Another example occurred last year when Professor Jim Harding from one of the Saskatchewan universities wanted to travel from Calgary to Los Angeles to Mexico City to Costa Rica to participate in a UN conference. When he arrived in Calgary and was about to depart for Los Angeles, the American authorities said they did not want him passing through their country. They considered him to be a dangerous person. The reason was that in his youth he had participated in a peace conference in the Soviet Union. As a student he joined with other students from around the world to discuss peace. He was obviously identified then as a Communist and an undesirable and denied entry.

I could go on with a whole list of similar incidents. Certainly the Minister does not need to have me lay out that list. Perhaps later on he could do us a service and stand up and give us some other peculiar events. That would encourage us, before we fall all over ourselves facilitating the U.S. in carrying out investigations here, to come up with a little bit of balance between the two countries.

Under existing law, U.S. enforcement agencies, before they can come into Canada to carry out investigations, must ensure that charges have been laid in the U.S. against the individual or individuals concerned. This legislation will change that. No, you do not have to have been accused or have charges laid against you. As long as the American investigative authorities believe there is some problem, they can enter Canada to investigate. The FBI can come in at that stage before any charges occur in the U.S. That will place a considerable number of Canadians at risk. Given the activities of some U.S. law enforcement agencies which have become public recently, I am not certain that we can have a lot of faith in the above-board nature of their operations.

Think, for example, of all those individuals who left the U.S. because they refused to serve in that immoral war in Vietnam. They made a very difficult decision and a number of them decided to seek sanctuary in Canada. They came here and are now citizens, and I suspect most of us know a number of them because they often play influential roles in our communities. These people would obviously be targets for this kind of undercover investigative work.

Then we have the people in the U.S. right now who oppose some of their country's foreign policy, particularly that aggressive foreign policy in places like Central America where the administration is bound and determined to fund the Contra movement and overthrow the Government of Nicaragua by force. I am pleased that our Secretary of State for External Affairs has on a number of occasions spoken out and indicated that Canada opposes that intervention. Yet the U.S. administration under President Reagan is doing everything it can to