

*Security Intelligence Service*

The doctors involved have now become concerned because the results of these examinations have been used within Canada by Canadians opposed to foreign Governments and by groups that are perceived by some to advocate the threat or the use of acts of violence for the purpose of achieving a political objective within some foreign country. Indeed, some of these physicians are actual members of organizations that donate funds and goods to opposition groups in foreign states that defend themselves in violent confrontations with governments in the pursuit of democracy and freedom. In their own words, the activities of these physicians are certainly directed toward opposition groups which are trying to obtain and achieve a political objective in foreign countries. These physicians would fall squarely under the definition of "threats to the security of Canada".

One could list a whole number of groups and individuals who are genuinely concerned about the pursuit of democracy in other countries and who are genuinely concerned about assisting the various groups that are attempting to achieve open and free countries. By the definitions we see before us in Clause 2 of Bill C-9, these people could then be identified as individuals who must be spied upon, whose telephones must be tapped, whose offices must be broken into and whose files, both public and private, must be opened up to ensure that they are operating in the best interests of Canada.

In rather simplistic words, that is why we feel that this clause must be deleted in its entirety and why we feel that it is important that the Government take action and delete this clause. I would encourage the Solicitor General to explain at least why the Government is ignoring the various concerns that Hon. Members have put before it and why it wants to proceed with the Bill with Clause 2 in its present form.

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Mr. Speaker, the motion put forward by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) might be considered frivolous by some. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what alternatives exist for an Opposition which has had its amendments dealing with this very important Clause 2 and related clauses struck out? What alternatives are available to an Opposition that wants to see an intelligence service well established with reasonable, well defined and responsible terms of power and authority? The situation before us then is an extreme situation. It must be so because there are no alternatives for an Opposition in the House today.

Bill C-9 offers the intelligence service powers and guidelines which are far too broad and far too vague. Many witnesses who appeared before the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee were quick to point this out. In response, the Government said that we must trust it. We must trust this Government after experiencing its 16 years of abuse? Perhaps the Government was not prepared to listen to the testimony of those witnesses who appeared before the committee. However, we on the opposition side were required to listen to those witnesses and were required to go home and speak to our constituents. We are well aware of how the Canadian public feels about Bill C-9. The thrust of that Bill is clearly wrong.

We on this side of the House recognize the seriousness of the amendment that has been put forward by the Hon. Member for Burnaby. Clause 2 goes to the very heart of the Bill. It is the definition clause and relates to several other matters as well. Within the definition clause is the definition which concerned practically all of the people of Canada, and that is, the definition of what in fact does constitute a threat to the security of Canada. When a Party puts forward an amendment seeking to narrow and to define that definition more clearly and that amendment is rejected, then we must take this extreme measure which I now support and approve.

Canadians have a good idea about what is meant by subversion. Our idea may be shaped by a cloak and dagger film shot against a background of foggy darkness. However, we know subversion when we see it and we know subversion when we hear of it. Subversion consists of more than an academic discussion which may take place around a kitchen table or in a church basement, whether it deals with the Cruise missile or any other matters of concern and interest to Canadians generally.

The view of subversion in this legislation is that subversion could be just about anything including those discussions to which I have already referred. Threats to our security are whatever the civilian Security Intelligence Service decides are threats. For example, part of Clause 2 reads:

—"threats to the security of Canada" means . . .

(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,—

That is a pretty broad definition, Mr. Speaker. The definition does carry on to exclude lawful advocacy, protest or dissent unless that lawful advocacy, protest or dissent is carried on in conjunction with the wrong activities referred to earlier. At first glance, one might conclude that the exclusion of lawful advocacy, protest or dissent resolves the matter. However, the real key question is who will determine what is meant by the words "in conjunction with".

Who is to say that the activities of a group of people in my church basement who are discussing the testing of the Cruise missile consist of no more than an intelligent and constructive conversation or that it is something more than that? What would happen then? An informer would be placed in their midst or some electronic means of bugging would be established or the telephones of those persons who took part in that discussion would be tapped. There is clearly no doubt that an academic discussion would not be in breach of the Act, but the fact that it was only an academic discussion would only be determined after a good deal of surveillance and supervision. That amounts to a testing of the credibility of the Canadian people before they are finally acquitted for having had those peaceful academic discussions. It is quite another question to make a judgment call as to whether or not such a discussion could be linked with something more serious.

The Government still argues that we should trust it. The Government argues that we need not fear the occurrence of fishing expeditions. It says that it is above that. I would argue