

Security Intelligence Service

that the essential faults which aroused so much opposition to Bill C-157 are still here.

Mr. Kaplan: I just wanted you to have two chances to speak.

Mr. Heap: It is not quite so extreme, but essentially as bad. Clearly the Minister has no intention, even in committee, of considering any serious amendments on the matter of the mandate, which is far too vague; on the matter of the broad powers, which are far too broad—

Mr. Kaplan: You can move amendments.

Mr. Heap: —or on the matter of the lack of proper parliamentary review. That is why his disingenuous plea that we send the Bill to committee to be discussed has to be turned down. Once we approve it in principle on second reading, then there is no possibility of stopping the Minister from ramming it all the way through.

On the matter of the mandate, Mr. Speaker, the point is simply that this Bill legitimizes what previously was perhaps unclear or possibly illegal; that is to say, the suppression of dissent, of legitimate criticism and legitimate organized opposition to Government policies. It is legitimate in that it does not involve any action or intention of violent overthrow or illegal subversion. Nevertheless, the experience of the last several decades shows that the present conduct of the RCMP, which will be no different in whatever civilian service replaces the RCMP, has been to use the Public Service to suppress dissent against a government, to suppress opposition.

One example of this, Mr. Speaker, is the widespread use of police photographers to film things like peace demonstrations. The most peaceful, even the smallest peace demonstration is subject to this kind of surveillance. We have the RCMP photographers there, in plain clothes but identifiable and sometimes acknowledging identification, taking pictures of everyone who goes on such a picket at the American Consulate, Queen's Park, City Hall or anywhere. That is a form of mild harassment which ought not to be used by the defenders of the law but is used regularly.

Another example is not so widely known but is much more intensive, and that is the harassment of individuals. I refer to the case of a student some 30 years ago who was registered as an ordinand in an Anglican college in Montreal. This student was actively engaged in a civil rights organization on McGill campus after a building had been padlocked by order of the then Premier of Quebec, Maurice Duplessis, under the infamous padlock law. This allowed him to padlock any building for a year on his say so because he thought it was being used for Bolshevik propagandism.

The city-wide protest against the padlocking of the United Jewish People's Organization hall because an Irish Roman Catholic priest had been allowed to speak about international peace was something that clearly the RCMP thought they had to suppress. So a student was harassed because he was active in a civil rights organization. The RCMP went to his teachers, the principal of his college, the dean of the Faculty of Divinity,

and it was made known through the grapevine that if he did not withdraw from that organization he would probably not be recommended for ordination. That is a contemptible abuse of the RCMP's power. Never did they allege this person had done anything wrong, let alone lay any charge or information against him. They merely said they have this man under surveillance and that was enough to intimidate the principal of the college. In turn, although it is regrettable, it was enough to intimidate the student into withdrawing from this organization.

There was also the case of a priest of the Anglican church who, when he moved to another diocese and took up secular work with the agreement of his bishop, found that within a few months the RCMP followed him to that diocese and made the same sort of dishonest insinuation to the man's employer and his bishop in the new diocese. In other words, they were attempting to undermine a person against whom they could make no accusation. This is the kind of dishonest trick which the RCMP has carried on in many cases.

I have given one example which I can document but I have heard of many others. This is the kind of thing which will now be legitimized by this Bill. This Bill will now give the appearance of legality to things like this. That is why this is a very destructive Bill. It will specifically allow, of course, the opening of first-class mail without the knowledge of the sender or recipient and without any possibility of any real control over it. It will specifically allow the infiltrating of groups for the purpose of disruption.

● (1410)

The final fault in this Bill is that there is simply no serious parliamentary review provided for. Members of Parliament are to be excluded from the opportunity of finding out what this service is doing, except such things as the service may choose to tell Members of Parliament. There will be no real opportunity to examine what is actually happening. Even the Mickey Mouse committee that is to be appointed will not have a real opportunity because the most vital documents can be and will be withheld from it. There will be no independent reporting on the doings of this secret service, this Canadian "Gestapo".

Mr. Roberts: That is shameful.

Mr. Heap: What is also very unfortunate about this Bill is that it appears to provide for putting the Canadian security service under the control of a foreign power.

Mr. Kaplan: There is a little difference between the RCMP and the Gestapo.

Mr. Heap: There are the provisions of allowing the service to sign agreements with unnamed governments. In other words, it does not have to report to the people of Canada but it may very well report to some secret service agency of any other government.

Mr. Kaplan: Does all of your caucus think that the RCMP is the Gestapo?