

*Business of Supply*

mates committee this question was raised. I had a little discussion with some of the opposition members on that committee. I undertook to raise this question with my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who had previously offered to give some material on a confidential basis. The response I received from the minister was that he would like to talk to me further about it. I undertook to the committee, and I again undertake, to try to work out some procedure whereby the information can be given without revealing any secrets which would harm the national security. However, I can give one assurance—

**Mr. Baldwin:** Here he is.

**Mr. Sharp:** The minister is now coming in. However, may I say there is nothing in the estimates we are now considering that is hidden in any way which relates to matters of security.

**Mr. Beatty:** Perhaps the minister can explain what is the budget for this year in terms of the cost of two groups within the Privy Council office. The first one is the assistant secretary to the cabinet for security and intelligence for his group. What are the details of the budget? Also, what are the details of the budget earmarked for the assistant secretary to the cabinet for emergency planning?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Chairman, in the office of the secretary who is concerned with the cabinet committee on security and intelligence, there are four bodies.

**An hon. Member:** Bodies?

**Mr. Sharp:** Four officials. That is the extent of the expenditure.

**Mr. Beatty:** The minister says there is nothing hidden in the Privy Council estimates. How much money is allowed for this fiscal year for those two groups? If he gave an honest answer to the committee, he can certainly answer the amount of money allocated for those two groups.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could go on to some other questions and this will be worked out. There is nothing secret about it. It means having to get their up-to-date salaries and working out for the hon. member how much that amounts to in total.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister what are the responsibilities of the assistant secretary to the cabinet for security and intelligence and the assistant secretary to the cabinet for emergency planning with respect to monitoring—and I am choosing my words very carefully—either directly or indirectly the peacetime activity of groups or individuals the government feels could become involved in future civil disorder? As background, I would bring to the attention of the minister the fact that following the FLQ crisis Lieutenant-General Dare was asked to prepare a study on the enhancement of crisis handling capability within the federal government structure, which recommended setting up part of this machinery. One of the responsibilities was to anticipate possible civil disorder and make contingency plans accordingly. I wonder if I might have the answer now.

[Mr. Sharp.]

● (2040)

**Mr. Sharp:** There are no such activities within the Privy Council office. There is nobody who acts in a capacity such as outlined by the hon. member.

**Mr. Beatty:** Has the hon. gentleman read the report which was prepared, and is he aware of the section in it which suggests it would be valuable to set up procedures whereby social disturbances in Canada can be anticipated? One of the statements in the report reads as follows:

In Canada, the systematic use of indicators is not being fully exploited, nor is there much evidence to suggest that indicators are being employed systematically in other countries. On the other hand, at least some of the relevant factors are considered informally in the process of ongoing social research and analysis.

A survey of current research on the prediction of social conflict using quantitative methods revealed that none of the methods studied could as yet produce reliable predictions. However, it is considered a promising area of research and it is concluded that studies should be pursued within the Canadian context.

What has been done in respect of this recommendation?

**Mr. Sharp:** I wish to assure the hon. member that this is not one of the functions of the Privy Council office. My understanding is that this is a responsibility specifically assigned to the Solicitor General.

**Mr. Beatty:** With respect to the transfer of activities of the CBNRC to the Department of National Defence, what is the nature of the activities of CBNRC? Is the information gained related essentially to defence matters, or is it related primarily to the Department of External Affairs and the responsibility of the Solicitor General with respect to security?

**Mr. Sharp:** There are some questions which I believe it would be inadvisable to discuss in open session, and security is one of them. I have spoken to my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who is seated beside me and he agrees it might be advisable to give certain information to some members of the House who could treat the matter in confidence so that it would be clear that the government is not engaging in nefarious activities or anything of that kind. But I hesitate to discuss security matters in committee of the whole.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Chairman, this matter was first raised fully two months ago and an undertaking was given at that time. Mr. Speaker suggested we might leave the matter until we returned after the Easter recess to see what had developed. Why has the government not consulted with the various House leaders in the course of the last few months in an effort to provide for a parliamentary oversight of security and intelligence organizations in Canada? Why was the minister personally one of those who refused to give unanimous consent to a motion under Standing Order 43 proposed by my hon. friend from Rocky Mountain and seconded by myself, which would have made provision for parliamentary oversight?

I have a further question to ask. It relates to whether the Prime Minister or the Minister of State for Science and Technology was giving correct information to the House of January 10, 1974. The Prime Minister was asked about the existence of a four-party intelligence treaty