

itself very readily to the sort of modifications" proposed in the report. The Hon. Tommy Douglas, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, also addressed this issue when he commented:

First of all I refer to the recommendation of the royal commission that there be a civilian, non-police agency because, as they point out, there is a wide difference between police and security duties. Without any reflection whatsoever on the very excellent service the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have performed, there is a great difference between law enforcement and the carrying out of the duties of a security service. There is a difference in the type of training required, the form of recruitment and the structure of a police force, on the one hand, and a security agency on the other.

I submit that it takes a certain degree of training and sophistication to recognize the difference between honest dissent and a desire to subvert our democratic form of society. Therefore, I think that the recommendation of the royal commission for the setting up of a civilian non-police agency has a great deal of merit, and I am extremely disappointed that the government has rejected this proposal out of hand.

This issue was examined again by the McDonald Commission in 1981; they concluded that the type of framework necessary for security operations would "work more effectively for a separate and civilian security intelligence agency than for a security service within the national police force".

The question of separation was reviewed once again by the Senate Committee last year, and once again the conclusion was the same. I think we have to agree with a comment the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) made in a press conference following the Senate Committee's report: separation can no longer be considered a major issue. After 15 years of discussing this matter and experimenting with alternatives, all the arguments are in: we need a separate and specialized agency to respond to the increasingly sophisticated threats to our national security.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I think that should be Saskatoon East. It wasn't Saskatoon West, I can tell you that. You had better get the security service on this one because I don't think you are right!

Mr. Kaplan: I will verify the attribution during the lunch hour.

As I have said, this is in no way a criticism of the RCMP. Members of the present security service have performed outstanding work under very difficult conditions. They have been asked to do a job when no suitable framework is in place to help them do that job properly. Yet they are able to command a high level of respect from the international community. They deserve a better system, and must welcome the prospect of a civilian agency and the improved direction and control such an agency will make possible.

I would like to stress that the RCMP is not, as some critics would have it, being removed from the security intelligence field. Indeed, as Hon. Members know, the legislation specifically provides in Part IV that the RCMP will have the primary jurisdiction to investigate security-related offences, offences which arise out of conduct constituting threats to the security of Canada.

Just as the Mackenzie and McDonald Commissions concluded that the police function is incompatible with the secu-

Security Intelligence Service

rity intelligence function, so too it is necessary to keep a security intelligence agency out of police work. Bill C-9, in making the investigation of security-related crimes the legislative preserve of police authorities, accomplishes this end. In short, in the security field the RCMP role will remain consistent with its well recognized and world renowned primary function, namely enforcing the law.

[Translation]

The new organization must at least be told, in the form of clear and unambiguous legislation, what it is supposed to do. That is why the proposed mandate is such an important part of Bill C-9. This mandate will be a definition by Parliament of the scope and limits of security intelligence activities. For employees of the Security Intelligence Service, it will be the definitive guide to their duties and also constitute a clear point of reference for assessing the efficiency and accuracy of security intelligence activities. By exchanging the present mandate, established by a Cabinet directive, and thus subject to amendment by Parliament and by Cabinet, for a legislated mandate that can be changed only by Parliament, we are taking a giant step forward in protecting the rights of Canadians.

[English]

The primary purpose of the service will be to collect and analyze information and threats to Canada's security. The current RCMP security service is mandated—and here I am quoting from the 1975 Cabinet direction—"To maintain internal security by discerning, monitoring, investigating, deterring, preventing and countering individuals or groups"; and then follows a list of security threats. I would like to remind Hon. Members that, in keeping with the recommendations of the McDonald Commission, the words "detering, preventing and countering" do not appear anywhere in Bill C-9. The new service will have no powers, using the McDonald Commission's phrase, to "take measures to enforce security". The primary purpose of the service will be restricted to the collection, analysis and reporting of security intelligence.

In Clause 2 of the Bill you will find carefully worded definitions of these threats: espionage and sabotage, foreign interference, terrorism and subversion. While each of these elements is important, the definition of subversion requires special attention. Other areas of the mandate are generally concerned with activities of foreign agents or activities directed by foreign agents; but subversion may involve Canadian citizens more directly. The definition of subversion draws the critical line dividing legitimate dissent from subversive activity, which may be put under surveillance.

There must be no doubt that Canadians are assured the basic right to engage in political dissent, and to advocate radical change in social practices, government policies or political institutions, without being subject to surveillance for so doing. The McDonald Commission describes the exercise of this right as "the lifeblood of a vibrant democracy", and we could not tolerate any system that threatened to interfere with this right.