

*Security Intelligence Service*

one of the Attorneys General said to the Committee, "Why do we not build on what we have?" We have that service there now. They have been trained in intelligence work. Why not build upon it instead of starting something brand new which has no checks and balances in it at all?

The Government is trying to ram down the throats of Canadians a civilian service instead of building upon the RCMP service which is already in place with well trained people. The Government is putting them into the civilian service. It is taking them out of the RCMP and moving them into a civilian service. It will have RCMP people there, but it will take away their uniforms. It will take away the RCMP aspect.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for indicating that I have only one minute remaining. Democracy reflects the thinking of the people. This Bill is just an indication or writing on the wall to the people of Canada that the new Leader and his Government will be the same old crowd, using closure and telling the people what is good for them. That is what is in the books for Canadians. They had better take a careful look at what is going on in the House today. It is an indication of what they will have for the next five years if they re-elect this crowd on the other side of the House, even though they have a new Leader.

● (2050)

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it might be possible to seek unanimous consent to hear the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) for another ten or 15 minutes. His remarks are most edifying and might enlighten the Members of the House. I would certainly be prepared to move such a motion if it met with the approval of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** The Chair will ask for unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta):** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) did not see fit to allow the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) to continue his remarks. Putting the best construction on it, he saw me getting up and I suppose he wanted to hear me speak. I would much rather that he heard the Hon. Member for Bow River.

This clause of the Bill has attracted more attention across Canada than most other provisions in this piece of legislation, that is, the issue of whether the security service should be part of the RCMP or should be a separate and totally civilian service. In every great debate and in every issue, especially a predominant one like this, there are two sides to the question. This issue has two sides to it as well. Some are attractive, some are not. It is our job to weigh the pros and cons. In this case it is not surprising that for us in the Opposition those things that seem to be attractive do not weigh very heavily against the parts that are negative.

The first attractive feature of separating the security service from the RCMP is the past work that the RCMP has been called upon to do for the security of the country. I refer to those incidents that took place mainly in the Province of Quebec about 15 years ago when they were accused and convicted of burning barns and raiding the offices of a political party in the Province of Quebec. Frankly, that has sullied the reputation of the RCMP. I do not blame those members of the force for wanting to see this particular service hived off the RCMP. That experience has hurt them. It has damaged the entire force. The problem is that many of us suspect that those directions came from political officers of the Government, that it was because of the political motives of the Liberal Government at that time that they were forced to do things they would not have done under normal circumstances. Therefore, the past history need not be the experience of the future. With an honourable government in office that need not happen again.

The second attractive feature is one of administration. I can well imagine that those in administrative positions within the security service might find it easier to operate the force if it does not have to think of both policing and security activities. To keep the security service separate from the RCMP may make it more simple to manage. It is a question of efficiency. Surely raw efficiency is not the bottom line when thinking of this kind of issue. There ought to be very relevant issues that form part of this debate on the administration of the force.

This brings me to the negative factors of splitting it, why we believe the security service should not be taken away from the RCMP. First, there is already all across Canada, in fact around the world, a trust on the part of the people in the RCMP. The people believe in the force. They trust it. They know the force to have a sense of honour. They know that given its own direction, without political interference, it is going to operate a good, well-managed, disciplined, professional service. Because of the history of the force, there is a sense of trust between the people and the force. That is something you cannot buy, nor is it something you can establish quickly.

Even if, in splitting the security service from the RCMP, you could establish a sense of trust, it would take a lot of time to build that kind of relationship between the force and the Canadian people. Since the security service is going to be in the background and not very visible, there is very little likelihood that it will establish that kind of trust. The RCMP did it by being very visible. We see them, they are around. We recognize them. When we recognize them and see the way they operate that trust is established. The fact that the security service is going to be a quiet operation does not allow that service to build that kind of trust.

The first reason we believe we ought to maintain a security service within the structure of the RCMP is because that force will need all the trust it can get from the Canadian people. Because of the nature of its work, the issues that we discussed in previous clauses dealing with such matters as security, what entails security, the nature of subversion and so forth and because the force will be dealing with very loose definitions, we