

*Security Intelligence Service*

even the RCMP are inherently bad because they often restrict the aspired licence of some individuals in this country, that I believe the majority of people in this country are in favour of an appropriate security agency. However, since we have not heard what all of the features of that agency should be, I agree with my colleague from Saskatoon that the committee should be given the authority to conduct hearings in all parts of Canada and report back when it has completed its work.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member indicated that he felt the new civilian security service should have certain powers to open first-class mail, particularly when there is a suspicion that there might be contraband in that mail. Does he agree with the Hon. Member for York North (Mr. Gamble) that the security service should not in fact have the power to open first-class mail when there is a suspicion that this mail may contain messages of a subversive nature? Does he believe that a distinction should be made between the suspicion of physical contraband being in a first-class envelope and the passing of messages, as his colleague for North York does, or does he believe that all first-class mail should be subject to opening by the new civilian security service?

**Mr. Lambert:** First, may I say that the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) must have been looking at something else because I did not say that this agency should have the right to open correspondence or parcels with regard to contraband. There already are ample provisions within the Department of National Revenue, customs and excise and the post office for that purpose.

With respect to the suspicion of subversive messages, I find it difficult to answer that because there are pros and cons to the issue. Let us take a case in which correspondence contains codes and the results of espionage. Let us say that espionage is being carried out in the United States by another country and that a post office box in Canada is being used as a marshalling point for the transmission of such information. Surely if it became known to the security agency that this means was being used, would it not be proper for the agency to apply to a court to allow mail being delivered to a particular address to be subject to scrutiny? I am talking about national security. I can think of dozens of ways in which our country can be seen as the softest touch in the world for those engaged in international espionage.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member also dealt in his remarks with the question of the mandate of the new security service. He went to some length dealing with the powers that it might possess. Would he expand upon his views with respect to the mandate of the new security service? Of course, having read the legislation carefully, he is no doubt aware of what could happen to a group in his constituency under the provisions of this Bill. Take the example of a church group in Edmonton that decides it wants to send funds or other material assistance to a movement in Central America which is engaged in an attempt to overthrow one of the dictatorial, oppressive and violent governments there so as to liberate people from decades of economic and social oppression. A

Canadian group or individual who wants to support that particular organization would be subject to intrusive techniques being used against it or him, even though many of us would argue that this poses no threat whatsoever to the security of Canada and Canadians. I hear the Hon. Member from Mississauga suggesting it does. I would welcome the intervention of the Member from Mississauga in this debate on that point.

● (1250)

At this juncture in the debate I would like to ask the Hon. Member from Edmonton whether he shares the view of his colleague from Mississauga that such activities by Canadians in fact constitute a threat to the security of Canada and should subject those Canadians to the full range of intrusive powers available to the nearest new security service under the provisions of this legislation.

**Mr. Lambert:** Mr. Speaker, on the simple basis which the Hon. Member puts it forth, there is no threat to Canada within or even without. If a Canadian citizen feels he wants to send money to a particular group in a particular country, it is that person's business. But I will say this much. If he sends it to a church group that enjoys the status of a charitable organization under the Income Tax Act, I would say right away that that organization should be disqualified because it is not carrying on charitable or religious work in the accepted sense. It is carrying on political work in some other country and that is not within the ambit of the Income Tax Act. Therefore, a choice will have to be made. As a matter of fact, some of the so-called charitable organizations front for activities outside the country which are not charitable. The Hon. Member being a man well versed in the law, I would invite him to review the legislation and the court cases with regard to what is the meaning of "charity" in the legal sense. It is not "benevolent" or "useful" but charitable within the meaning of the Act. Then that will follow.

But let us go on and develop the theme beyond what the Hon. Member suggested. He set a simplistic problem. I do not want my answer to be taken as a simplistic approval of a much bigger thesis, because there may be a point of halt. May I say that I would certainly have legislation available—and this may be something we may have to consider here—that in the event hostility should break out involving Canada, or a serious threat of hostility, all of this goes by the board. Many of these safeguards have to go by the board. The Hon. Member is too young to have gone through World War II. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that so many of the things that he and some of his colleagues seem to want and insist upon—I do not know, but I suppose acquired rights—in wartime just do not exist. The national will says that the thing to do is survive, and that has to be understood.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** The period for questions has ended.