

Privilege—Mr. Stanfield

tions manual, or whatever title it might have, that would contain the procedures under which our security service would operate in terms of political candidates and their supporters. I would maintain that the existence of the manual may raise a question of privilege, sir. I believe the Solicitor General said quite clearly that there is no question of privilege because of the way the procedures have been implemented. I am not quite sure I am prepared to accept that, nor would I believe that many members would be quite prepared to accept that.

We have a situation where a person nominated for political office is checked against a subversive list. I do not know what lists are subversive. In this House we have heard for many months now about the EPO list. Is that a subversive list, sir? I do not know. My name may be on it, and other names may appear on it. It could be that the name of a candidate to be nominated tonight in any one of our ridings may be on that so-called extraparliamentary opposition list. In my opinion that would give rise to a question of privilege.

While the Solicitor General did not confirm the accuracy of the entire *Globe and Mail* story, neither did he deny it. For example, I notice in that story that a contributor who gives more than \$10 to a particular candidate may be the subject matter of a report in the implementation of the procedures in this manual. I think that would affect my privileges. If a number of my potential supporters, who are prepared to contribute to my campaign a sum in excess of \$10, might be subject to surveillance simply because their contribution was over that specific amount, I believe my rights and privileges would be affected. These contributors might choose to support me in ways other than monetary donations and similarly become the subject matter of surveillance under these manuals.

I am happy to hear from the Solicitor General the manner in which he believes a manual is being implemented. However, I would suggest that the mere existence of a manual, which is quite properly before the McDonald commission but in no way abrogates the rights of the highest court in the land, has to give rise, in my opinion, to the dangers that can flow from two things; the existence of the manual and the fact that its procedures are being implemented by cross-checking against certain lists of which I know absolutely nothing.

As a potential member of parliament from any one of the more than 280 ridings in the next election, I would feel very strongly that in this particular case this should form the subject matter of a serious question of privilege and be referred to that group of our creation which is charged with the responsibility for investigating such matters.

● (1232)

The fact that no member of parliament has been the subject of surveillance since 1968 is of precious little comfort. I am happy that is so, but it provides me with no comfort for the future. If a candidate for the 1978 or 1979 election potentially is subject to surveillance because of this manual, that provides me with little comfort. If he is the subject of surveillance

[Mr. Jarvis.]

because he is a candidate and not because he has been involved in subversive activities—

Mr. MacEachen: No.

Mr. Jarvis: The Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) can indicate no; but if a nominated person in my riding happens to be on the EPO list, for example, according to what was said by the Solicitor General, he can be subject to surveillance. That affects the rights and privileges of members, as well as of potential members. I am not sure there should be a distinction, because the ballot boxes determine that, and not the House of Commons.

While I welcome much of what was said by the Solicitor General, and his apparent willingness to acknowledge the right of hon. members to ask questions in this area, I disagree with him when he denies that this is the proper subject matter of a question of privilege.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we heard a good many words from the Solicitor General (Mr. Blais) this morning. Of course some of them are reassuring, but we are not reassured as to the basic issue.

The question raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) deals with the fact that privileges of parliament may have been breached, because certain members of parliament are to be subjected to surveillance by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. We realize that being a candidate or a member of the House does not grant absolute exemption from normal security inquiries. What we are talking about here is someone who, by reason of his candidacy, is considered to be subject to surveillance. We are told the only persons concerned in this matter are those who are on a list of subversives.

The word "subversive" is so broad that it might include a wide variety of individuals. We do not know which of us is regarded by the police as being subversive for some reason or other. We do not know which of the candidates in the forthcoming election will be regarded as subversive. So, we are left with the proposition that a list can be used for the purpose of selecting members of parliament to be put under special surveillance. This is not because they were suspected of some wrongdoing long before they became candidates or members, and thus are subjected to surveillance, but simply because of the fact they were nominated, and thus are subject to potential surveillance by the police. That is an infringement of the rights of hon. members.

I forgot to bring with me the report of a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday. The report appeared in the newspaper this morning. He defined the list of those who could be subjected to surveillance, which definition was far more broad than that of the Solicitor General. The definition of the Solicitor General is very loose. I do not know of anything which could be considered looser than the use of the word "subversive". For example, in the State of New York, under the American constitution the word "subversive" has been found to be unconstitutional because of its vagueness