

parts of the world, not only in countries which are controlled directly by NATO.

In the *Bloor Street Leap* the Committee suggests:

Suppose a visiting foreign government minister, whose country has for many years been the recipient of Canadian church mission work, requests a private meeting with Canadian church officials.

That might be interpreted as meaning that the church was thereby being influenced by a foreign power. Inasmuch as the meeting was private, it could be interpreted as being clandestine. The Committee is speaking of the kind of activity which happens from time to time in Canada and is carried on by churches for purposes about which they are quite open, but which might under this legislation be viewed as worthy of intrusion, phone bugging, mail opening, the planting of informers, or even an *agent provocateur*. The proposed surveillance of lawful activities has the Bloor Street United Church and other churches worried. The Bloor Street United Church quotes from the Canadian Council of Churches' brief, which reads:

—how much of the day-to-day life and work of the church could be held to be foreign-influenced?

The church was an international organization before Europeans ever heard of Canada or North America. For 2,000 years the church has been sending messengers and representatives to every country it could, keeping up contact and mutual influence with the people of those countries. This legislation could be taken as grounds for attacking the very foundation of the historical growth of the Christian church.

● (1240)

The Bloor Street group says further on, and I quote:

Even a partial increase in surveillance could do harm to the network of voluntary participation that Canadian churches have established throughout the world.

The group points out, on the basis of the brief of the Canadian Council of Churches and its own study, that there is no definition in the Bill, not even a listing or even any mention, of possible limits to surveillance. In other words, it is saying, what is to stop this new force from carrying on, and even extending, the kind of illegal activities which were the subject of the McDonald Commission?

The religion of which I am a representative, ordained as such, was founded by a person who was executed for treason. He was also accused of blasphemy, but that was not the charge for which he was executed. He was executed for being, in effect, a threat to the security of the Roman state, the most militarized power on earth. The United Church of Canada is seriously concerned, nationally and in its congregations, that the militarized thinking of this Government is now being turned into a threat to the basic liberty of Canadians. The alternative of the United Church, Mr. Speaker, is that Christians must respond against this militarized thinking with the assertion that freedom, not war, is the chief condition of humankind, and I quote:

To this end, a critique of national security doctrine, based on the Gospel, has been developed.

Security Intelligence Service

"Whereas national security doctrine urges the individual to renounce freedom by seeking security from an evil world under the protection of lords and tyrants . . . the Christian Gospel urges love of enemy, refusing to give absolute value to security and finding the only absolute value in love."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has elapsed. Debate.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this particular Bill and on this clause. The points which have been raised have been interesting. The purpose of legislation in a democracy, as I understand it, is to endeavour to reflect the thinking of the greatest possible number of people, both in the legislation and in the administration. When that is done, there is more than one thing accomplished. When the legislation is in line with what the mass of the people of a country think, then it is going to have the support of that mass of people. When legislation is not supported by the majority of a population, then there are difficulties. Things then go under cover and things are done because people feel that the law is stupid or, as someone once said, that "the law is an ass". I do not believe we should put our people in that position. When we pass legislation which is contrary to the thinking of a vast number of our people then we are really looking for some difficulties.

I believe that is what we are doing with regard to this legislation, particularly if the ruling of the Speaker is confirmed—and I hope it will not be—and we are unable to discuss security under the RCMP at the report stage of this Bill. The Bill deals with security, and the fact that it does deal with security, I believe, should leave open all types of security for discussion, not just the particular one recommended in the Bill. Otherwise it is useless discussing principles on second reading of a Bill. If you cannot change any of the principles, you might just as well save your time and energy. Surely things can be changed in a Bill. If it cannot be changed after second reading, then we are introducing a new scenario in which I feel every parliament would have to be very careful of what it passes in second reading. Every second reading might have to be opposed. Even then there would be no chance of making changes.

Surely, we have to be sensible in our legislation. When legislation is passed in principle on second reading, it does not mean that the important parts of the Bill cannot be changed. That is the way I understand the making of legislation. In every legislature in the country, and probably in every Parliament in the British Empire, Bills are passed in second reading and then a very important principle of that Bill is changed by the majority of the people. If that cannot be done, we are not

As my seatmate, the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker), mentioned earlier, my people very strongly want the RCMP retained as the security force in this country. It will be a blow indeed to democracy if we are unable even to discuss that at report stage of this Bill, as was suggested this morning in the interim or temporary ruling of the Speaker of the House.

I would like to advance two or three reasons why I believe the legislation should deal with every type of security, includ-