

abiding Canadians would find themselves before the courts and in jail as a result of some activities in which they were legitimately involved, and the harassment potential of Bill C-9 would simply be used to muzzle them. On behalf of all Canadians, I will fight Bill C-9 and this clause until the end of time.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise this afternoon to make some comments on the second motion before the House on Bill C-9. The general thrust of the motion is that Clause 2 be deleted from the Bill. Consider the reasons for that. We are talking about the clause in the Bill that is perhaps the most important of all. It attempts to identify all the interpretations of the very critical terms included in various parts of the Bill.

When you look at what this means, I am afraid that our Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) begins to make Ronald Reagan look like some kind of a bleeding heart. For example, Clause 2 talks about foreign influenced activities. Numerous church groups, priests and ministers from a variety of churches throughout my constituency have studied this Bill and the implications thereof. Like many other Canadian humanitarian organizations, churches maintain a variety of very direct links with colleague agencies in other countries through development assistance grants of one kind or another, through church and seminary support organizations, through various human rights documentation and advocacy groups, through ecumenical exchange of personnel from one part of the world to another, and through assistance to general refugee groups and various relief organizations and activities around the world.

Furthermore, the graduates of mission-related schools, associate and partner churches and agencies, may rise quite conceivably to positions in the political or economic life of a variety of these countries. In the world-wide church family, there is a great deal of exchange and collaboration, hence a good portion of the day-to-day life and work of Canadian churches and church organizations and agencies could be held to be foreign influenced. Of course, that relates directly to Clause 3(b) referring to foreign-influenced activities.

The point is that when talking about foreign-influenced activities, we include the groups that are indeed engaging in some type of dissent. Now this dissenting group could be called a group of subversives. It could be identified as a group carrying out some kind of subversion. We in the New Democratic Party have had some real concerns expressed to us by church and religious groups, peace groups, trade unions and various community organizations. They feel that mission work abroad, development education and the various peace advocacy groups could all be determined to be some kind of subversive activity led by a subversive group. This causes us concern. When the Solicitor General hears of all of these concerns, I really wonder why he does not stand in his place and react to them.

Mr. Kaplan: Why did you not bother to come to committee?

Security Intelligence Service

Mr. Riis: I wonder why he does not comment on them. After all, report stage is the point for us to raise concerns and perhaps hear some explanations from the government side. The government benches are mute on these concerns. I hope that eventually the Solicitor General and some of his colleagues will rise in their places and comment.

I am concerned about the need to incorporate in Clause 2 the terms "espionage" and "sabotage". Espionage is already defined in Section 46(2)(b) of the Criminal Code. It is an offence in criminal law today. Why does it have to be in this Bill along with the word "sabotage" which is defined in Section 52 of the Criminal Code and can be dealt with adequately in that area? A whole list of these various terms are involved. Their purpose is anything but clear.

I now move away from the concerns I have for the terms espionage and sabotage to the next subclause, which is again much too wide. It is very open and vague. Let me give an example of how this is a concern to me. It reads:

(b) 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,

I want to refer to the Crown corporation Petro-Canada. Frequently parliamentarians rise to condemn Petro-Canada as some kind of subversive corporation. They say it was introduced by the Government not in the best interest of Canada, not in the best interests of energy security or developing self-sufficiency in a very critical resource called petroleum. Are we not hearing Members of Parliament in a sense carrying on subversive activities that incite people to move against the decision of the Government? Oil company presidents, vice-presidents and chief executive officers condemn Petro-Canada as something that is working against the national interest, whose mandate is against the best interest of Canada. By this Bill, these executive officers and other executive members of Canadian and foreign-owned companies could be identified as urging activities that are detrimental to the interests of Canada and could be defined as being clandestine, deceptive or involving a threat to the country or to Canadian persons. Basically what this Bill is saying is that those kinds of individuals including parliamentarians could be identified as carrying on foreign-influenced activities within and relating to Canada.

● (1330)

I would like to raise a concern that was brought to the attention of the committee by a group of Canadian physicians who found themselves involved in examining patients whose injuries were the results of torture in their home countries. These patients were seeking refugee status in Canada and had gone to members of the medical profession to have evidence of their torture verified and documented in order to make the case that to send them back to Chile or whatever country was involved would certainly not be in their best interests because, upon returning home, they would likely be imprisoned, shot or tortured further.