

large degree in detail, to the proposals I have put forward. I think we owe it to them and to the national security of the country, and to the Canadian people in general, to provide leadership in this area as a Government. That is the reason for this Bill.

I do not agree with most of the criticism I have heard. If a method could be worked out for Members of this House to consider the Bill, it would be something I would like to look into. But I want to make it clear that this is the direction in general terms, and in a considerable amount of detail, that this Government wants to lead the Security Service. I think much of the criticism is totally off base and I would not want any decision to refer the subject matter of the Bill to be taken to indicate that I think this Bill is wrong and that *carte blanche* is being given, or doors are being opened, or civil rights are being abused by the Bill. In my view the Bill does the opposite. I believe that in fair hearings of the committee that will be seen to be the case.

#### MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, the whole purpose of such an inquiry would be to examine the very things the Minister asserts, for which there is some support in some parts of the House and no support in other parts of the House. The Minister has indicated his willingness to discuss that possibility and I will arrange to have that discussed with my colleagues.

In the meantime would the Minister consider that very important substance of our parliamentary system which has been eroded, that is the concept of ministerial responsibility? Would he indicate to the House that his mind is not closed with respect to a review of the question of ministerial responsibility for security matters, which strikes to the heart of our parliamentary system and which may very well be important to the acceptance of this legislation generally, and the creation of a Security Service in Canada?

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada):** Well, on that subject the Bill has sought to create a balance with, on the one hand, full ministerial accountability for the operation of the Security Service and, for the first time in legislation, a requirement that the Minister be fully informed and ready to respond to Parliament about all of the matters being carried out or not being carried out by the Security Service.

So far as the limitation in Clause 6 is concerned, to which the Hon. Member must be referring, that the Minister should not be enabled to overrule the director with respect to a particular case or report, I think that is a wise safeguard because it assures that the agency will not be used for partisan or improper purposes by the Government and that it will not become the private police force or private agency of the Government. To me, that is an extremely important safeguard in the interests of our democracy. It is also the system that commended itself to Australia, another parliamentary democracy, which has adopted, in virtually the same terms, exactly

#### Oral Questions

the proposals which I believe the Hon. Member is condemning. Therefore, one can have a parliamentary democracy which provides that safeguard, but I have certainly heard him and I have heard the other criticism on that subject.

● (1440)

**Mr. Pinard:** He should read the Bill.

**Mr. Kaplan:** I think it would be a good issue to explore in committee. I think it is one which ought to be preserved.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

##### CANADA-UNITED STATES RADAR TESTING PROJECT

**Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence who, 13 months ago, in reply to a letter of mine, wrote that the purpose of the joint Canadian-American research project being conducted in the prairie Provinces, ostensibly on radar ground clutter, was to improve the capabilities of civilian and military radar at low levels. On Saturday I learned that that may well have been a sham, and that one of the main purposes of this project is to improve the survivability of U.S. Cruise missiles. Will the Minister tell the House what is the real story? Is this a radar improvement project or is it a Cruise missile development project?

**Hon. J. Gilles Lamontagne (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I think I did answer the Hon. Member on June 16, 1982, very clearly explaining the purpose of the program. It has nothing to do with the Cruise missile. It is related to the testing of the low level radar. As the Hon. Member knows, when any missiles or any low flying aircraft comes over Canadian airspace it mingles with clutter on the radar screen. What we are trying to do—

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is happening on the Treasury benches.

**Mr. Lamontagne:** —by this test program across Canada and the United States is to try to find out how we can eliminate this clutter on our radar so that we can identify these missiles or low flying aircraft, and in so doing identify the low flying object, thereby improving the security of the country.

##### INQUIRY RESPECTING COMPUTER PROGRAMMING FOR CRUISE MISSILE TESTING

**Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake):** Madam Speaker, for the last number of months in Alberta, where the tests have been going on, experts from the Cruise Missile Technology Group of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have been going in on a weekly basis to monitor the testing. They are of the opinion that this testing is being done to prepare computer software to help the Cruise missile to fly over terrain in western and central Europe. I would like the Minister to comment on that situation. People who are conducting these tests right now are saying that this is to prepare computer