

Privilege—Mr. Oberle

been clearly applied in circumstances in which a minister, during the course of debate, has made reference to a document to support his argument, that document not being in the possession of others who are arguing in the same debate.

The clear, common sense of the rule is that all participants in the debate ought to have the same advantage. On the other hand, precedents have equally indicated that this rule was never intended to imply that simply by putting a question to a minister during the question period about the existence of a document, and then having him get up and say that no such document exists, it is possible to insist upon the document being tabled on the ground that the minister had referred to it. However, the argument is still not concluded and I will hear further from hon. members.

Mr. Oberle: If the minister is, as seems obvious, not prepared to table the document at this point, I am certainly prepared to follow the responsible course outlined by the leader of the New Democratic Party by blanking out references to individuals and organizations named in the letter, and I should like to read into the record the letter I have in my possession which we believe to be the letter which caused all the controversy. It is a letter dated June 15, 1971, and it is under the letterhead of the Solicitor General of Canada. It reads:

My dear Colleague:

I have recently received a report containing information which the Security Service has accumulated about the concept of "Extra-Parliamentary Opposition" (EPO) as interpreted by advocates of the New Left in Canada. The report also draws attention to the activities of various persons and groups, some of them employees of the Federal Government, who support the EPO concept and who appear to have as their aim the destruction of the existing political and social structure in Canada.

The EPO concept, in the context of the New Left, does not mean legitimate pressure group activity but rather the creation of counter or parallel institutions within society but opposed to it and to the electoral process. Through such institutions the New Left seeks to organize and radicalize the "underclasses" of society and mould them into a revolutionary force capable of overthrowing the present socio-political system.

● (1530)

According to an article . . . which appeared in the November/December 1967 issue of . . . "people will not move against institutions of power until the legitimizing authority has been stripped away". The radical EPO program of the Left is, in short, a movement strategy predicated on a total and unequivocal rejection of representative democracy, its destruction and the creation of radical alternatives.

An integral part of this strategy is . . . in Toronto, which is under the control of two editorial members of—

And a certain institution.

They are attempting, through a program of workers' and community control, and in conjunction with organizations such as . . . in Montreal to implement the radical EPO program. . . has, for example, penetrated and gained control of the Just Society—

As an interesting sideline, I suppose the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) might be offended by this particular term.

—originally a legitimate citizens' group, and is utilizing this organization as a radicalizing agent among the poor as well as a stepping stone into other legitimate welfare agencies such as the Toronto Metropolitan Social Planning Council and the United Appeal. Through the Just Society . . . the recent Poor People's Conference, was able to turn this Conference into a sounding board for its radical EPO program and revolutionary propaganda. . . has also been active

[Mr. Speaker.]

in the sphere of industrial unions, such as the Reform Caucus of the Canadian Labour Congress, endeavouring to establish contacts who might be receptive to its concept of workers' control. There are indications that . . . through contacts in government, was able to ensure that it received a recent federal grant of \$68,000.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Oberle: There is more interesting reading, if my colleagues will bear with me.

Of more concern, however, is the presence within certain government departments and agencies, particularly CMHC, of a small group of former campus revolutionaries. This group was led until recently by . . . of the Canadian Union of Students—

These names will soon all be public and then hon. members will know them; it will make for much more interesting reading.

This radical revolutionary has left the country but his disciples remain.

The short-term political objectives of . . . group include the organizing and radicalizing of sympathetic civil servants and getting them to support its long-term political program of socialist revolution. These people are also involved in dissemination of government information to other radical groups across the country. For example, we have information to show that a member of the Task Force on Youth has passed on information from the Task Force to a New Leftist, who was a representative of . . . at the recent Poor People's Conference.

Though a number of . . . group within the Public Service is small, probably not in excess of twenty-five, the picture presented is worrying, suggesting as it does a conscious attempt by various persons to use the knowledge and the influence gained by their employment with the Federal Government to further their own ends. For this reason, I have attached a list of those we suspect of being engaged in or sympathetic to EPO activity in one way or another, with the recommendation that steps be taken to ensure that these people have been fully briefed as to their responsibilities for ensuring the security of government information and that their activities be watched with more than normal care.

He then goes on to say: "I have sent this same letter to our colleagues Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Munro, Mr. Lang, Mr. Marchand, and I will be discussing this matter with the Prime Minister in due course".

This letter is addressed, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Robert Andras and is signed "Jean-Pierre Goyer, Solicitor General of Canada". I am at liberty, Mr. Speaker, to disclose that one name on this list is that of Walter Rudnicki, who was a senior policy planner with Central Mortgage and Housing at the time; and I am prepared to allege that this senior civil servant was fired for the reason of being on this list.

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, I intended to speak—

Mr. Speaker: Is this on the same point of order?

Mr. O'Connell: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a very narrow aspect of the point of order. Regardless of the fact that the main contents of the letter have now been made public, it seems to me that the point of order had to do with a request for an expurgated version of a letter, one with certain names omitted. An expurgated document, I suggest, is not a document within the meaning of the rules, either the scope or the intent of the rules or comments in *Beauchesne*. A document referred to or cited by a minister of the Crown, if it is required to be tabled, must be tabled as the document and not as a modified document. So I would suggest very briefly, Mr. Speaker, that