

## CANADIAN SECURITY AND MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

The Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence

Chair: The Honourable Colin Kenny

Deputy Chair: The Honourable J. Michael Forrestall

February 2002

[...] [page 60]

### **17. The Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) Mandate**

The Committee learned that the operations of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service are basically limited to the collection of intelligence in Canada. Except for the investigation of immigration cases, it lacks the resources to routinely operate in foreign countries.

James Corcoran, the former Deputy Director of Operations of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, testified that under the existing Act the Security Intelligence Service has the power to operate in foreign countries in discharge of its mandate to investigate threats to the security of Canada. Its primary mandate, of course, is domestic. A foreign intelligence service could be established as a separate unit in CSIS through the simple elimination of the words “within Canada” from section 16 of the CSIS Act. A former Commissioner of the RCMP agreed that if it is decided to establish a foreign intelligence capacity, it should be incorporated into CSIS, rather than delegated to a separate agency.

Wesley Wark argued that, notwithstanding the accuracy of Corcoran’s remarks, Canada does not have a true foreign secret service capacity, which it needs if only to maintain an independent role in the global intelligence business and to keep its place at the allied intelligence table. In his opinion, over the past [page 61] years Canada has let what foreign information gathering capacity it had deteriorate. In his opinion:

- The communications security establishment needs both the resources to upgrade its technology and more political attention;
- The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade has severely reduced its capacity to report on the politics of foreign countries;
- The Department of National Defence needs more resources for military intelligence, particularly for additional analytical experts.

This testimony came before the announcement of additional resources for security in the recent budget. “The first line of defence against terrorism”, said Dr. Wark, “is intelligence”. In his opinion, improved intelligence can once again be used to help Canada influence the decisions of allies, as was the case during World War II and the Cold War.

In response to the claim that more resources would have to be allocated to military intelligence if Canada is to remain a member in good standing of the allied intelligence community, General Jurkowski, the recently retired Chief of Staff for Joint Operations of the Canadian Armed Forces, acknowledged that, as a member of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence (which links Canada and the United States), he often had the feeling that he was considered “the Canadian freeloader.” He did not have intelligence of equal value to offer in exchange for the intelligence he was seeking.

In Professor Wark’s opinion, the budget of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service should be increased. He told the Committee that a decision to develop an overseas intelligence capability would add an additional and large expense to the budget of CSIS and would take a decade to produce results. He believes that reform of the security and intelligence agencies should be both internal to the agencies and external. It could be carried out by a Parliamentary committee, issuance of a White Paper, or creation of a Royal Commission. The [page 62] process, in his opinion, has to be open to debate and understanding and led by a supportive Prime Minister to ensure that there is change.([75])

Major General Maisonneuve, Assistant Deputy Chief of the Defence Staff outlined three priorities in strengthening military intelligence:

- a. Enhance the human, as opposed to the technological, collection of intelligence, by training more personnel in the collection of intelligence from human sources;
- b. Enhance the analytical capability of the Forces to deal with the ever increasing volume of information, by hiring more analysts and by forming partnerships with outside cultural, academic, etc. experts; and,
- c. Establish an “information fusion centre” that will receive feeds from all collection assets and analyse the information.

([76])

Gary Loeppky, Deputy Commissioner of Operations of the RCMP, agreed that sometimes it would be useful to have an off-shore intelligence capability, since much of terrorism is driven by homeland politics. In most cases, however, Canada can already get the information necessary from partnerships with foreign agencies. Canadian analysis of information collected abroad, however, might be valuable. ([77])

[...]

([75]) Proceedings, Issue 3, 1 October 2001.

([76]) Proceedings, Issue 5, 22 October 2001.

([77]) Proceedings, 22 October 2001.