

that fishing expeditions will be inevitable if the definition clause of this Bill is allowed to pass. It is the opinion of the Government that undoubtedly it will pass. However, we cannot forget that Clause 2 relates as well, to efforts within Canada to achieve political objectives in foreign states.

● (1340)

Every night on the news we watch acts of violence in other lands. Does support in Canada for the Solidarity movement, the Sandinistas, the Israelis, the Palestinians, or any of the dozens of trouble spots, or for the Canadians involved in those trouble spots around the world, make that people subject to surveillance by the intelligence service or a threat to the security of Canada? According to Clause 2, it will. There is no denying the acts of serious violence which are taking place in the far corners of the world. I regret that. I also regret the fact that the Bill which is before us does not make clear when I as a Canadian will be involved in that threat and how far I would have to be involved in support of another faction before I am subject to this Bill.

I regret that my time is drawing nigh to the end of the ten minute comment. Clause 2 is one of the most important clauses in the entire Bill. It is the heart, the crux, the definition clause. It will be the clause referred to when the civilian Security Intelligence Service is attempting to decide whether or not a Canadian has infringed or will infringe upon the civil liberties of Canadians. For this reason, the sloppy workmanship in the drafting of the Bill, it should be subject to repeal and redrafting. In lieu of that, it should be disposed of by the approval of this motion.

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I think that "pleased" is the wrong word to use when one addresses his or her feelings with respect to participating in a debate on a subject such as the one which is before us today. However, I am pleased to support the amendments to Clause 2 which were proposed by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). In addressing Clause 2 there are a few things which I would like to say in the few moments which are available to me.

In reading Clause 2 of Bill C-9, I must again draw attention to some of the verbiage within the existing clause which deals with definitions it reads as follows:

"threats to the security of Canada" means

(a) espionage or sabotage that is against Canada or is detrimental to the interests of Canada or activities directed toward or in support of such espionage or sabotage,

The phrase "detrimental to the interests of Canada", in its various contexts, as it appears within the clause, is so wide that it has brought forth a number of vigorous objections from groups as varied as the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the Canadian Council of Churches.

Subclause (b) reads:

—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,

Security Intelligence Service

There are so many "ors" in that subclause that each could be taken independently. It is not "and". It does not have to be a definition pursued by the new Canadian Security Intelligence Service that includes all of those things within any one of those clauses. Any one of the "ors" will do.

Finally, subclause (c) reads as follows:

—activities within or relating to Canada directed toward or in support of the threat or use of acts of violence against persons or property for the purpose of achieving a political objective within Canada or a foreign state,

If we delete some of the "ors" we can have the clause read: "(c) activities within Canada in support of a threat of violence against property for the purpose of achieving a political objective within a foreign state". It is when we reach the kind of meaning which is implicit in that clause that we begin to get more than a little concerned. The power to define threats to national security is so broad that it is incumbent upon us to consider the mind of the Government and the mind of the security service which it will set up.

We are not considering previous faults. The RCMP has many good points, but it also has faults. This Bill, in part, has arisen out of concern regarding those faults, particularly the faults which were evident in the early 1970s. We must be concerned with the state of mind of the Government and of an agency which will be empowered, at least in the initial stage, to make definitions and to carry out various surreptitious and clandestine activities.

I find it more than a little disturbing that the report of the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), which covered the activities of the last year, indicated that some 545 electronic surveillance warrants for national security purposes were issued within Canada. I am particularly concerned that there were only 699 other applications for authorization to wiretap by the RCMP for all other purposes. Some 44 per cent of wiretap authorizations in Canada last year were for "national security reasons". I do not mean to downgrade the importance of this nation, but when 44 per cent of authorized wiretaps are for national security reasons—even within a subagency of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which has more important things to do as far as the public is concerned—what are we likely to see in terms of intelligence activity, wiretaps, surveillance and opening of mail once the bureaucratic imperative comes into play and we have an agency whose sole *raison d'être* is security and intelligence? At least 90 per cent of the Canadians whom I am acquainted with have not placed those kinds of issues at the top of their agenda. To have a separate agency which has as its sole reason national security and intelligence, and given the record when it is a minor department of a larger agency, I really fear the direction in which we are going.

I have a number of signatures on petitions from my constituents which relate exactly to those concerns which my colleagues and I have been discussing today and to concerns which have been discussed earlier with respect to this Bill. My constituents are very worried about the grave possibility which I have indicated. As I said, we must address the state of mind of the Government.