

Supply—Justice

It is felt, and I think with justification, that since all efforts to placate and deal reasonably with this particular sect have failed, since they have persisted in spite of those efforts in their campaign of violence, the time has arrived when they should be treated sternly—not harshly—and that the offences they are committing justify a certain amount of severity. That is why they are receiving penitentiary terms for the offences of nudism and the background of the situation is in the minds of the judges in imposing sentence.

The headline of a report in the Vancouver *Sun* of June 15 intimates a break between Ottawa and British Columbia because of the Doukhobors. It states that the relations between Ottawa and Victoria over the handling of the Sons of Freedom are nearing a cracking point. That indicates the seriousness of what appears to be a difference of view between the authorities in the department and the authorities out there as to the sentences that should be imposed.

The background of that difference of view appears to lie in the fact that the federal authorities are reluctant to provide the penitentiary or jail accommodation for these Doukhobors. No doubt the committee is aware that sentences of six months and under are the responsibility of the provincial authorities in the way of providing necessary jail accommodation, whereas penitentiary sentences are, broadly speaking, a federal responsibility. Because of the number of offences that have been committed the federal authorities are worried, and I can imagine they have cause to be, over the accommodation they will have to provide in the penitentiaries as a result of the sentences imposed.

Not to labour the point, I think I can conclude by saying this: If the officials of the Department of Justice will realize that this problem can no longer be dealt with by placating the Doukhobors, if they will realize that it requires stern measures, then they will appreciate that our courts must impose severe penalties in order to let this sect know that they cannot continue to defy our whole system of law and order. Penitentiary sentences must be imposed.

It is not a case of the British Columbia authorities wanting to evade responsibility in providing the required prison accommodation, it is simply a case of their having to impose these sentences if they are to deal adequately with this campaign of terrorism and violence. If the federal authorities will appreciate that there is that necessity, the irritation which exists, according to this press dispatch, will disappear and perhaps there will again be

good will between the federal and provincial authorities, which is necessary if there is to be a solution of this problem.

Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North): Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the minister would have some comments to make on the two very thoughtful speeches that have been made about a problem about which I imagine the committee is fairly ignorant. I should like to introduce a new subject at this time however, although I have made previous references to the matter of security clearance. The minister knows my views quite well. I am dissatisfied with the statement he made on June 12, when, if my memory serves me aright, he said that the deputy minister of a department would decide who should stay and who should be dismissed for security reasons. I should like to know if my memory is correct because I do not want to do the minister an injustice.

It seems to me that that is giving too much power to a deputy minister, power of a kind which he might not appreciate. Secondly, and more important, it does not give the civil servant, who after all is a citizen of Canada, the security which he should have. To put it briefly, my opinion is that if a civil servant is suspected of subversive activities, within limits, the facts should be made known to him and he should have the right to present his case to a board of review. The board would consider the facts and report to the deputy minister, who in turn would report to the minister. The minister would be the last court of appeal as far as the accused person was concerned.

What I am most concerned about, and I am quite sure the Minister of Justice shares my concern, is that the rights of the individual shall be protected. A state can be arbitrary and individuals can be arbitrary, and at all costs the rights of the citizen must be protected. I would like to know in what way the rights of the civil servant will be protected.

Mr. Garson: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I have much to add to the statement that was made before in reply to a question by the hon. member for Kamloops. That statement can be perhaps oversimplified by putting it in these terms: The head of a department always has had the right, even before this question arose of securing the unquestioned loyalty of all civil servants, of seeing to it that the members of his staff were properly fitted to do the work for which they were responsible. When the question of security arises, the head of the department is under continuous responsibility to see to it that every member of his staff is one from whom complete responsibility can be expected in the matter of loyalty. That being the case,