

Protection of Privacy

Mr. Nielsen: That is very true. I did not wear a helmet, if the minister means it in the classical sense of a metal helmet. But I did wear a helmet in the aircraft I flew. I certainly did not wear the kind of helmet the Prime Minister was wearing, riding around on a motorcycle in Montreal, advocating that people not go to Europe to fight for freedom in this country. I can say, further, that I added a year to my age to get into the forces; I did not lose two of them to stay out.

The only purpose for the invocation of that measure, and its only accomplishment, was to seize—

Mr. Olivier: You are a stranger in the night.

Mr. Nielsen: I cannot hear the member.

Mr. Olivier: I say you are a stranger in the night.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member says I am a stranger in the night. The hon. member for Louis-Hébert says I don't understand. When those two members over there can say they have lived in every province and territory in this country, as I have, then they can criticize me for not understanding. But until then let them be silent.

An hon. Member: New Brunswick got rid of you.

Mr. Nielsen: I am afraid I did not originate in New Brunswick.

Mr. Lang: Who got rid of you first?

Mr. Nielsen: The only purpose the invocation of that measure served was to gather reams and reams of paper and documentation. I must say it succeeded admirably in that. I must say it is to the advantage of the nation to have that kind of documentation of subversive activity; but it was a hell of a way to go about getting it—to invade the privacy of homes in the middle of the night and arrest and detain people under that kind of measure. But that was the purpose of it. And we have never had any explanation, on any basis, for its invocation since then. Hon. members opposite know that, because even the media have come around to criticizing themselves for supporting it.

Mrs. Morin: You must know why they did that.

Mr. Nielsen: Perhaps the hon. member will explain when she addresses herself to this subject. I would like to learn.

Mrs. Morin: Don't tell me you blame the media.

Mr. Nielsen: I would be the last one to blame or criticize the media, but I have occasional observations to make with respect to its accuracy. It is a night for true confessions. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal has confessed his, I have confessed mine, and several members of the media have confessed with respect to the position they took at that time.

I see the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) grinning in his seat. He was the minister who followed the senator who preceded him, who is now in the other place. I say this about that hon. gentleman, that as long as he was solicitor general he resisted the setting up of the security planning and analysis group. He did not permit it to

[Mr. Crouse.]

happen, because he knew of the dangers inherent in that kind of secret police force in this country. Then he was shunted aside. He sat on the front benches for a while, not on the treasury benches, and then was lateralled into that place where all party faithful eventually are lateralled—the other place. After that, the Minister of Supply and Services became the solicitor general, and it was with the greatest alacrity that the security planning and analysis group came into being because he knew he had to go along with the ideas of the Prime Minister on this, and with that small cadre of people who surrounded him, with respect to the philosophy of the establishment of this group.

Mr. Goyer: What about your own *réseau* of information?

Mr. Nielsen: I did not hear the question, so I cannot reply. But I will say that that group would never have been established under a Conservative government; and I still say there is no need for such a police force in this country. The Minister of Supply and Services and the Solicitor General can try until they are blue in the face to assure me, others on this side of the House and other Canadians outside it, that this group does not perform police work, when in fact it does. They take refuge behind the explanation that it is not an operations group, that it conducts no investigations. But, Mr. Speaker, all they need do is lift the telephone to the RCMP and say, "Look here, old Joe Blow down there in the reserve in Saskatchewan is giving a little trouble and we think it may be aimed at subverting the government of Canada." And bang! He has an intercept on him right away under this provision in the bill.

The minister shakes his head as though this is not true. I have a memo here, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to cite the date or the author. But I will cite the recipient of it, W. J. Davbos—Lieutenant-Colonel Davbos. It is entitled "Social defence and the Indian." It is quite a lengthy memo, of several pages. There is outlined in it the threat to Canadian security that is being offered—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but his 20 minutes have expired. He may, however, continue if there is unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nielsen: You don't want to hear it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert).

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I am really disappointed at the members of the Liberal Party not permitting the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to proceed with his speech. I always believed the Liberal Party was thought of as the great reform party. Now I am beginning to think of it as the great reactionary party. After hearing the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) and the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin), who have been the two main Liberal spokesmen at the report stage of this bill, I can only come to the conclusion that the