

Dalhousie student infiltrates

by Cathy McDonald

Last year's Gazette reported on a Dalhousie student who had infiltrated a local political fringe group, for which he was paid by the RCMP.

The person, whose name was withheld, became actively involved with 'In Struggle', a Marxist Leninist organization, to glean information on its activities, and personal information on the members and their supporters.

He was encouraged to make close friends in the group and perhaps sleep with someone, in the hopes of gaining support in case he was accused of being an infiltrator, according to a statement released from 'In Struggle' and confirmed by other sources.

The student's conscience

bothered him, and he revealed his position to 'In Struggle' and terminated his affiliation with the RCMP.

The RCMP paid the student up to \$125 per month, from October 1979 to February 1980. The individual described the sources of his affiliation with the RCMP as stemming from some drug problems he had three years previous. The RCMP then contacted him again, offering him some needed money.

The article looked further into RCMP methods of recruiting informers:

The infiltration of In Struggle is not an isolated case, but is an example of established RCMP practise, as revealed by the two Commissions of Inquiry into questionable RCMP practises, reads the article.

The RCMP have been shown to make extensive use of politi-

cal informers whom they recruit by manipulating human weaknesses. Confidential health records, are secretly obtained to learn of an individual's emotional problems or perhaps treatment for mental illness. Potential informers can thus be humiliated or pressured into cooperation. Other methods of recruitment include long interrogations, reminding the person of his criminal record and money offers. This is apparently the scenario in which the Dalhousie student found himself.

The Globe and Mail quoted one RCMP source as saying "a traditionally right wing Mounty's definition of a potential subversive might differ widely from the interpretation of many other citizens. "Infiltrators are not only used to gather information, but to disrupt a group, harrass it or undermine its leadership.

assumed to be free from any restrictions on university surveillance. Mr. Goyer agreed. The McDonald Commission found this to be "a somewhat unwarranted interpretation."

Although Mr. Starnes wrote a memorandum following these decisions stating that the situation in regard to campus surveillance was not clear and that he expected "...Division Security Officers to intensify or maintain, as the situation warrants, our coverage of the university milieu," it appears, according to the McDonald Commission, that the RCMP security forces believed that they were effectively precluded from any investigation on campus.

Mr. Trudeau reiterated cabinet policy to the CAUT in January 1978 and extended it to include all security forces (the armed services, the RCMP, etc.) but stated that no one can be regarded as immune from investigation or surveillance if there are reasonable grounds for believing that he or she is, or has been engaged in subversive activities.

It all depends, as the McDonald Commission recognizes, on the definition of subversive. The Commission supports the current policy of the cabinet. "The main reason for limiting the activities of the security intelligence agency on university campuses is that excessive surveillance will have a chilling effect on the freedom of discussion and debate which is an essential characteristic of the liberal university." The Commission says that the campus cannot be a sanctuary for criminal activity. But the key is in the definition of subversion, and the Commission accepts the Prime Minister's letter to the CAUT, provided subversion is defined and limited in the manner indicated in the Report.

The Commission suggests that the RCMP have used the fact that some groups held illegal parades, meetings or strikes to give them carte blanche to infiltrate on the grounds that an illegal and thus subversive activity had taken place. The Commission makes it clear that the security forces should only be concerned with serious threats to the democratic order. "Most attempts by violence-prone groups to interrupt the process of rational discussion on campus," it suggests, "appear not to fall in this category and should be handled by local police."

The CAUT will be requesting an interview with the government to further clarify the surveillance activities of the security forces in the light of the McDonald Commission.

They always get their student

The following is an excerpt from the final report of the McDonald Commission on the R.C.M.P.: Freedom and Security under the Law, Chapter II - "Acts Beyond the Mandate", pp. 343-7.

In the mid-1960's the Security and Intelligence Directorate of the R.C.M.P. reached the conclusion that much subversive activity had its origins in universities and colleges and it was anxious to improve its coverage of such activity. While subversive activity was still considered by the R.C.M.P. as predominantly Communist, it was no longer seen by them as exclusively so. Thus, in Quebec there was evidence that terrorist sympathizers were active in universities and other educational institutions. The Security and Intelligence Directorate therefore decided to put special emphasis on the development of sources in the university milieu, but to do this within the constraints previously imposed by government. There is no evidence that sources were developed from among students, but it is clear that a good deal of effort was devoted to the recruitment of faculty members.

In attempting to devise ways and means of attacking this problem, many and varied methods, short of conducting on-campus enquiries, have been considered and implemented. As indicated above, however, the success achieved has been negligible and leads one to question the suitability of our current techniques. In analyzing these methods it is obvious they are ineffective and completely inadequate in light of current demands. This can, for the most part, undoubtedly be attributed to the present restrictions placed, by the Government, on subversive enquiries at educational institutions. It is evident, however, that

no appreciable progress can reasonably be expected in this area without the cooperation of, or liaison with, select faculty members of the universities concerned. Our experience during the past six years has clearly shown that the desired information is simply unattainable off campus and, if we are to suc-

ceed in this important undertaking, our current methods will require a degree of revision. It is felt that with tact and diplomacy we could achieve our objectives, or a good portion of them, without transgressing the assurances we have provided to the government.

It will be recalled that in 1961

the Government was assured we would refrain from conducting enquiries on subversive activities on university campuses. Instructions in that respect are contained in our memorandum of 21-6-61.... This restriction is still in effect and, under the circumstances, we are bound to abide by this directive until such time as it is revoked. It is significant, however, that the restriction pertains exclusively to subversive enquiries with no objection being made to the conducting of legitimate security enquiries. Throughout the dispute of 1961/62 relative to our on-campus investigations, the necessity of legitimate security enquiries was conceded by even our most vocal protagonists. This position was never refuted during subsequent debates and apparently has been accepted by all concerned.

While we are morally, and indeed, honour bound to respect the assurances we made to the Government in this area, paradoxically, we are still burdened with the responsibility of keeping the same Government abreast of Communist penetration of the education process. However, since we are under this dual obligation it is clear that the probable solution lies within the realm of security enquiries through which it is possible to establish liaison with faculty members. Such enquiries are, in fact, the only legitimate grounds on which we may establish this liaison. Since our efforts are restricted to this one avenue, we should exploit the opportunity to the fullest possible extent in keeping with our heavy responsibilities in this area. As a point of interest, the limited success we have enjoyed to date was, in large measure, accomplished through this medium.

