

integrity." The government also recognizes that no organization is perfect, and that there is some validity in the view of the royal commissioners that some basic differences do exist between police and security duties, by their very nature.

It is therefore the government's intention, with the full understanding of the R.C.M.P., to ensure that the Directorate of Security and Intelligence will grow and develop as a distinct and identifiable element within the basic structure of the force, and will be more responsive, in its composition and character, to the national security requirements described by the commissioners. The basic aim will be to develop the security service so as to draw on the police services for personnel of suitable qualifications and character, and to retain administrative, research, documentation and other services in common with them. The security service, under the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P., will be increasingly separate in structure and civilian in nature.

● (2:20 p.m.)

New and more flexible policies in relation to recruiting, training, career planning and operations will be calculated to ensure that Canada's security service will be capable of dealing fairly and effectively with the new and complex security problems which we will undoubtedly face in the future, and also to ensure that it clearly reflects the nature of our cultural heritage. Under the new arrangements it will be possible, for example, for an increasing number of university graduates from all parts of Canada to join the Directorate in a civilian capacity and to aspire to positions at the top of that organization, thereby making the kind of contribution referred to by the commissioners. Nothing in the proposed changes will unfairly prejudice the career expectations of people already in the service.

Some of the comments in the report which refer to the R.C.M.P. are more properly directed at aspects of government policy. We intend to keep under review our basic policies and procedures in relation to security, as the commissioners have recommended. The establishment of the Department of the Solicitor General in 1966 was a major step in this direction. Further advances have been made since that time in improving the efficiency of the R.C.M.P., even though they have not been overly publicized. I do not propose to describe these advances in detail, except to say

*Statement by Prime Minister on Security*

that they represent a careful and methodical build-up of modern technical facilities directed toward the detection and prevention of large scale organized crime, as well as the provision of information which the government requires in order to ensure the security and integrity of the state. This latter is one of the major and most difficult duties of any democratic government. It is one which, perhaps more than any other, requires public reassurance that the measures taken in its discharge are not of a character which could infringe the basic rights of individuals or be damaging to their careers and reputations.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the government, after careful consideration, has decided to accept the commissioners' recommendation for the establishment of a Security Review Board. Full details of the scope, character and operation of the board are still under consideration and these may differ in some respects from the commission's recommendations. Hon. members will recall that in 1967 provision was made, by amendments to the Financial Administration Act, for public employees subject to dismissal on security grounds to be given an opportunity to be heard by an independent person at a formal inquiry. The commissioners suggest a broader system of review of the decisions of departments, which would—

—preserve the requirement for governmental responsibility and decision, give adequate protection to sensitive information and sources, yet provide a reasonably effective safeguard against arbitrary, hasty or ill-considered judgments, and perhaps also avoid the necessity of ad hoc inquiries into individual cases.

It is their opinion that such a system of review might be required in the three areas of employment, immigration and citizenship. The three basic principles which they would apply are: first, that the individuals concerned be given as many details as possible of the factors which have entered into the decisions; second, that the decisions of the Review Board could only be advisory; and third, that the importance of expertise and understanding in security matters is such that the same board should review contentious decisions in all of the three areas.

With these basic principles the government agrees. They were, in fact, the guiding principles in the establishment of review procedures for dismissals on security grounds devised by the government under Prime Minister Pearson, and announced in this house on October 25, 1963. I must say that those procedures appear to have worked well