

Security Intelligence Service

sion years, funds came the other way from the UMWA. They came back into Canada to help the depressed families when the going was tough and the coal miners were not working.

• (1620)

The point is that we have a clause that would enable action to be taken against people because they are fighting for their convictions, for their freedom of choice. Surely our people should not be put in that position when they fight for their convictions in the belief that this will make a better country. I say that for both sides in that strike.

I remember walking through a crowd in front of the bands of men and women who were on the side of the Canadian union. It should have been called the communist union. I remember them with their pitchforks, shovels, axes and knives. What could happen with definitions like this with regard to threats to the security of Canada, the political objective within Canada or a foreign state?

I urge the Minister to consider the definition of "threats to the security of Canada". Suggestions have been made as to alternatives which makes some sense. At present it is far too wide. I urge the Minister, even at this late stage, to bring in amendments. If Canadian men or women so much as talk to a union, they may well become a marked man or woman. That is not freedom of speech or freedom of tenure. That is not the kind of country I envision Canada to be.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion before the House today which, if adopted, would delete Clause 2 of the Bill to establish a Canadian Security Intelligence Service. What we find offensive in this clause are the subclause near the end of the clause. The rest is simply definitions of an employee, a foreign state, who the Inspector General is, who the Minister is and that sort of thing. It then tries to define threats to the security of Canada. There is quite a detailed explanation as to what threats to the security of Canada might be. It states, and I quote:

(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 Criminal Code defines "espionage" and "sabotage" effectively and directly, yet we have a very detailed explanation here which goes beyond the Criminal Code explanation. It "fuzzifies" the whole definition. The balance of the definition of threats to the security of Canada is as follows:

(b) foreign influenced activities within or related to Canada that are detrimental to the interests of Canada and are clandestine or deceptive or involve a threat to any person,

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

I will read the final subparagraph because it should be on the record:

(d) activities directed toward undermining by covert unlawful acts, or directed toward or intended ultimately to lead to the destruction or overthrow by violence of, the constitutionally established system of government in Canada, but does not include lawful advocacy,—

That is the disclaimer.

—protest or dissent, unless carried on in conjunction with any of the activities referred to in paragraphs (a) to (d).

That opens up a lot of questions. The Canadian Council of Churches went through this Bill. They have some questions which have not yet been answered. They pose questions concerning the interpretation of subparagraphs (b) and (c) of that clause. They wondered if that clause could be construed to mean that lawful church activities and mission work, or lawful church and community activities, including development education, peace advocacy and human rights defence, might not fall within those definitions. How could a church lawfully raise money, as many churches are now doing, for governments in Nicaragua, Guatemala and a great many countries in Africa where churches are providing assistance, countries that are in a politically unstable state? Sometimes our country does not approve of the government in power at the time.

Would it be construed as going against the best interests of Canada if our current government did not approve of their current government? If members of an activist group in another country came here to address the church group, would they subject themselves to surveillance? Would their activities fall within the definition in Bill C-9? In defining the powers of this Bill, it is a question of what is in the interests of Canada?

The interests of Canada are not defined in this Bill. Some of the interests of Canada may be defined in the Constitution, but it is hard to find much in that. Ultimately it comes down to somebody, somewhere in the security service, deciding what are the interests of Canada. They do not report to the House of Commons or to the Parliament of this country, yet the interests of Canada are supposedly being looked after. Someone elected to the position of looking after the interests of Canada has no way of finding out what this agency is doing and what is defined to be in the interests of Canada. We could well have the little social affairs committee of a church in Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan subjected to surveillance by the new security service because it has chosen to discuss the political situation in a country such as Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The churches also have some problem with the definition in subparagraph (b) and pose this question: 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. This is not a hypothetical kind of question. In the last couple of years, officials who are former church officials and are now members of the government of a foreign country have come to Canada to discuss that very item. When such a visitor comes, he inevitably comes in part to ask for assistance. He attempts to enlist the aid and advice of his Canadian friends in the churches. What would that action be deemed to be by this faceless agency that is deciding what are the interests of Canada? Would it be felt to be in the best interests of Canada for a group of church people to be discussing development and political problems that exist in a foreign country with someone from that country, or would the agency that is deciding what is