

Prime Minister at that time by giving what appears to be a rather vague direction to the security force which could very well have been interpreted by them in a very broad fashion? Unless the Prime Minister is prepared to show the House that the mandate was quite precise at that time, he will have to accept the interpretation which I am putting on this.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would want to read the blues because the hon. member for Halifax said something which I may not have understood correctly. I understood him to say that my concept of internal subversion may well have led to the surveillance of the Parti Québécois. If this is his feeling, then he has the explanation why the police decided to exercise surveillance of the Parti Québécois. They had the same conclusions as the hon. member for Halifax. I have told him that this was not in our mind, and when we discovered that this was being done we, contrary presumably to the hon. member for Halifax, would say that this is not a form of internal subversion, this is a democratic party.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Prime Minister's acceptance yesterday of responsibility for the scope of security operations, how can the Prime Minister evade responsibility for his failure to define precisely the meaning of internal subversion, which not only I but many others would interpret, perhaps in the circumstances, as including the operations of the Parti Québécois? How could he personally say that he discharged his responsibilities by making clear to the police that this does not include the operations of such a democratic party?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference of view, here.

**Mr. Alexander:** Yours is wrong.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The hon. member for Hamilton West says that mine is wrong. He disagrees with me and perhaps he agrees with the hon. member for Halifax, but let him hear my answer and then he will be able to decide what is right and what is wrong after he knows the facts. The hon. member for Halifax presumes it would follow, if one is going to look at internal subversion, that you would conduct a surveillance of a democratic party.

● (1432)

**An hon. Member:** It could follow.

**Mr. Trudeau:** In our minds it did not. In my answer earlier I indicated that internal subversion was spelled out in the guidelines mentioned to the House by the Solicitor General on Friday. I have already indicated that it was the kind of subversion which might come from the use of violence or other illegal acts by any person. Obviously, if they were looking at separatists, it would make sense—and perhaps here I would agree with the hon. member for Halifax—that they would look at known separatists. I do not see anything objectionable to this. It is not objectionable that they would look at members of any party, whether it be the Conservative Party or a separa-

### Oral Questions

tists party, who deserved surveillance for some reason. All I am saying is that it should not be systematic surveillance of the party as such, and I understand the hon. member for Hamilton West disagrees with this.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

### PRIME MINISTER'S GUIDELINES TO MR. STARNES CONCERNING ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the Prime Minister concerning the actions of Mr. John Starnes, a man whom I understand was appointed to his position at the personal recommendation of the Prime Minister. He said in a cable, which was sent to RCMP officials in Montreal some six days after the break-in of L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec, "In this pre-election situation", he would not recommend this kind of action, and he also said "pre-election times". That would seem to fit in with the Prime Minister's interpretation of the rule of law, fitting in with the sort of spirit of the times attitude. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, with specific reference to Mr. John Starnes and his responsibilities, did he ever indicate that such illicit operations would not be acceptable, or conversely, with regard to Mr. Starnes, did he personally ever make it clear that they would not be tolerated?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party is referring to a telegram which was tabled before the Keable Commission in Quebec. That telegram related to a specific event. In order to find out how that event had come about, the break-in at APLQ, Mr. Starnes was, with some indignation as the telegram indicates, saying: "What did you do this for? I want to find out more". His words were: "I needed, in order to decide how best to deal with the matter in terms of the Prime Minister and the minister, both of whom have received representations from the APLQ and their associates"—

**An hon. Member:** You are reading it. Table it.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The answer is contained in these words themselves. Mr. Starnes wanted to know how to deal with this subject because the Solicitor General at the time had been asking how he would answer the telegram sent to him by the members of the APLQ. Mr. Starnes was asking his subordinates for information about it in order that he would be able to direct how to answer it. How that was answered was stated some time ago when I believe the present Solicitor General dealt with those matters last spring.

### BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—REPLY TO MR. STARNES' CABLE OF OCTOBER 12

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I am prepared in this instance to accept that the Prime Minister did not understand the question as I put it. The question I