

does not include lawful advocacy, protest or dissent unless carried on in conjunction with any of the activities referred to in paragraphs (a) to (e). I could go on but I think that suffices to give you the flavour of the things we are concerned about.

The Canadian Council of Churches, including such churches as the Anglican Church of Canada, the Armenian Church in North America, the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Coptic Orthodox Church, the Greek Orthodox Church, the Lutheran Church in America—Canada section, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Reformed Church in America—Ontario Classis, the Religious Society of Friends, the Salvation Army, and the United Church of Canada, have all expressed their concern that the definition of threats to the security of Canada is vague and uncertain and hence excessively broad. They expressed the view that they are particularly concerned about the effect of broad interpretations of paragraphs (b) and (c) of Clause 2, the clause we are dealing with at the present time. Their submission was that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service could construe lawful church activities such as mission work and/or lawful church and community activities, including development education, peace advocacy and human rights defence as falling within these definitions, and hence to determine previously lawful activities as threats to the security of Canada.

With regard to Clause 2(a) and (b), there is much concern with the vague phrase "the interests of Canada". What are the legitimate interests of Canada? Who defines them? 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? These are the kinds of things we are seriously concerned about, and it was in that light that I referred to other general concerns. For example, in paragraph (b), we should 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. If he wishes to decrease his country's dependence on Canadian exports while maintaining or increasing Canadian aid to his country—

Mr. Kaplan: That is the third time I have heard that speech.

Mr. Young: It may be the same speech but it is worth repeating if it gets the message through his tiny ears.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments on Clause 2. Members are well aware, and I suggest that most people who are watching are aware as well, that we are dealing with the definition clause. In the short five years I have been in Parliament I have discovered that these clauses are frequently the key to any legislation. Any parliamentarian who takes his responsibility seriously would take a good, hard look at definition clauses. A constituent asked me

Security Intelligence Service

last week whether, if we take the security service out of the hands of the RCMP and place it in the hands of a civilian agency, as the Minister has asked us to do, that means that the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would be eligible to be the director of this security service. Could that be done through an Order in Council without going through the House of Commons? Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what could happen. For people in the City of Calgary, in my region for the most part, the thought of that kind of appointment to this kind of a job was extremely bothersome. When you combine that principle with the looseness of definitions which currently exists in Clause 2, then I think you are asking for trouble in the future. The difficulty with Order in Council appointments is that they can always be made without public examination and for partisan purposes. They do not happen always, but the temptation is always there.

In the case of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service we might have a somewhat different view of the need to have really tight definitions. That is conceivable. The RCMP have made a couple of mistakes over their 100 years and more of existence. But it is an organization with a training program, a tradition, and a concept of the law and its place in Canadian society. With loose definitions, an organization like that is not likely to overstep; in fact it is less likely to overstep the bounds. But when we are dealing with a civilian agency, with a director appointed in secret through Order in Council, then I suggest we are putting a tremendous amount of temptation in the hands of a government which sooner or later will make a partisan appointment. We have seen that happen with the CIA in the United States. We have heard suggestions, through literature and the media generally, that the appointment process for the CIA, and even for the FBI, makes the office holder feel some sense of being beholden to the political Party that makes the appointment. Someone said we changed Ali Baba, but we still have the same 40 thieves here on Monday as we had on Friday. If that is the case and the Government is going to use its massive majority to bring in time allocation, or closure, to ram this legislation down the throats of Parliament and put in place this civilian agency to which the Cabinet makes the appointments, then the only protection we have left is to tighten up the definition. We cannot have that temptation sitting here waiting to be exercised within a framework which excludes that agency from very little if anything.

If you read Clause 2 of this Bill, you find that it is conceivable that any Canadian who actively contributed to a movement to drive the Russians out of Afghanistan or Poland or Czechoslovakia, anyone who is predisposed to support that kind of a movement, according to an interpretation of these definitions, could be subjected to a complete and thorough security investigation by this agency. People may be investigated for their participation through the donation process or perhaps through their membership in a church that is involved in an internal conflict in another country. According to these definitions, any member of that church or anyone who contributed to the activities of that church can be legitimately investigated. Anyone who chooses to donate time or talent to a