

In the next amendment, paragraph (b), the Hon. Member proposes the words, "foreign activities within Canada". I do not think the Hon. Member has improved the language, the significance, the meaning of paragraph (b) in the original Bill, that is, "foreign influenced activities." The amendment reads, "foreign activities".

Some of these activities may be foreign, some of them foreign influenced, some of them may be foreign inspired, and some of them may be natively inspired, coming out of the substance of Canadian thoughtfulness but directed toward subversion and harmful to the vital national interests of Canada. I do not think that is an improvement on the paragraph where it reads:

—the interests of Canada and are clandestine or deceptive or involve a threat to any person,

Involving a threat to any person, I suppose, is looking at terrorism, but the whole thing is all mixed up, Mr. Speaker. It is not just activities designed to pull down the institutional structures of Canada. That is one aspect of it. There is another aspect, the terroristic aspect involving persons. What about the pursuit of persons? That is contained somewhat in the original paragraph (b). I believe that the notions there ought to be properly filtered out, clarified and assigned their proper role, not just jumbled together. That is really my criticism of the definitions as they stand in Bill C-9. The motions are jumbled together and are not clearly set out. That will not help—and I am directing my words to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) who is listening—nor will it assist any security intelligence agency if its functions and the notions that define those functions are jumbled.

I plead with the Minister to accept some redefinition and clarification of the threats to the security of Canada as outlined in the definition clause of the Bill.

I cannot quite understand the technique of the Hon. Member for Burnaby. His Motion No. 2, which is one of those we are talking about, deletes this clause. Then his Motion No. 6 deletes certain sections of the threats to the security of Canada, and his Motion No. 7 deletes certain other sections of the threats to the security of Canada. I think he was attempting to have a number of amendments in his own name by dealing with paragraph after paragraph after paragraph. At the same time he suggested that the whole clause should be deleted. I do not know what he wants to do in proceeding in this manner. I wonder whether he knows. If one clause is eliminated, then it goes. Perhaps he thought half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. However, at the same time I feel that he is suggesting an unusual procedure. First he suggested that we should eliminate the whole thing and, if we could not do that, we should eliminate one portion of it and then another portion of it.

● (1310)

It would have been much better for him to examine the notion of the threats to the security of Canada. He could have clarified them, as he can clarify them; he has a fairly good thinking mind. He should have clarified them, sorted them out

Security Intelligence Service

and un-muddled them. Then he would have rendered a much greater service to the parliamentary process.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to rise to speak on the motions relating to Bill C-9 which are now before the House, those motions being Nos. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 that were grouped for voting. Despite the claptrap which were heard from the government side, it is not the intention of anyone in the House to not have a security service in Canada.

What we are trying to get across to the Canadian public is that the Government is not supported in many of the definitions and clauses in this Bill. To date, either in committee or in the House, either publicly or anywhere else, the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) has not taken the time to put evidence before the people of Canada or before us as to why he is seeking the kind of legislation he is obviously seeking. The Solicitor General has not come forward, nor has any Government Member, with a supporting list of Canadians who would like to see the legislation brought forward, particularly containing Clause 2. That clause goes much further than Canadian tradition or Canadian law would demonstrate is required. Interestingly enough, it is not supportable in terms of the great republic to the south of us and the studies which it has conducted through its general accounting office, Congress and Senate in looking at the operations of the CIA. In fact, they are going in exactly the opposite direction, in terms of definitions and activities, to what the present Solicitor General of Canada is trying to do.

The Solicitor General is trying to bring in a definition of threats to the security of Canada which is so broad that it would include—and I am humble in having to tell you this—yourself, Mr. Speaker. The definition is so broad that certain activities in which you are involved, Mr. Speaker, such as going to church, could perhaps be considered under the very broad rubric of the definition used by the Solicitor General as requiring the security service to have to go out and target.

I was glad to see that some of the Tories were finally rising to speak on Bill C-9. Certainly they have said in British Columbia that they are opposed to this legislation, but they do not demonstrate that very sincerely in the House or in committee. The point which must be made in terms of Clause 2 is the concern of major groups in Canadian society. I am referring to those groups concerned about civil liberties and human rights and about the proper role of dissent in Canadian society. What are they saying, groups such as the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Council of Churches and so on? I will deal with them in a few moments.

I suppose Clause 2 as proposed by the Solicitor General is supported by some Liberals. When they find out what the electorate thinks about it, I am sure they will cut themselves loose of Bill C-9 as fast as they can, particularly this clause. The clause allows for the targeting of responsible groups or individuals who happen to work on issues inside or outside Canada that have political objectives. Unfortunately, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) was unable to be here, so the opposition Party had to