Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

If we have to engage in a filibuster in the House and in committee to deal with the freight rate structure, the rationalization of that structure, the abandonment of service, the level of service and all the other negative things that Canadian National has engaged in, that is what we will have to do. I do not relish the prospect of engaging in filibuster tactics any more than anybody else. However, in a situation where logic, common sense and reason do not prevail, where the valid complaints of citizens of Canada are unheeded by a government that has a mentality like concrete-well mixed and well set-the only course available to us is confrontation. If filibuster and obstruction tactics are the only way to get at the meat of the situation, then let us engage in them. If that is the kind of game the government wants to play, that is the kind of game we will have to play, either until the demands of the people meet with success or until the government decides to call an election or do whatever it wants. That seems to be the only course available.

Reluctant as we are to waste our time, the time of the House and the time of committees, that is the course we shall have to follow in dealing with these matters. The primary consideration—I know that this may sound foreign to the government benches—is justice. Justice must prevail. Let us attempt to get it.

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the hon, member call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—RELEASE OF YVES GEOF-FROY FROM ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY— INQUIRY AS TO ADVICE FROM SECURITY PLANNING AND RESEARCH GROUP

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, on February 29 I directed a question to the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) for which I have received no reply so far. It had to do with any advice that he is deemed to have received from the security planning and research group, as he called it in his statement of September 21, 1971, on page 8027 of Hansard. Previous to that occasion I had asked the Solicitor General a question on December 28 of last year to which I received what I considered an unsatisfactory answer. The minister so much as said that if I would like to check Hansard I would find all the information I would require with regard to this group for which the Solicitor General is responsible. In other words I was told to do my homework.

I checked through *Hansard*. I specifically checked the editions of April 1, 1971, September 7, 1971, September 9,

1971 and also the minister's statement given to this House on September 21 of that year. With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, the answers to the questions I had asked were not there. So at this time, as a result of the minister's inordinate preoccupation with keeping the functioning of this particular group secret, I should like to put on record a number of other questions in the hope that an early answer will be provided in this House when estimates are considered or on some other occasion.

First, I request that the government table the job description which appeared in British Columbia outling the functions of the first job available in British Columbia for this new, so-called group or intelligence branch as one might refer to it. Second, is the Solicitor General aware of representations made by the British Columbia Federation of Labour criticizing the entire notion of the establishment of this branch? Third, could the Solicitor General also outline the organizational basis of this unit? Will it be organized regionally or will it be organized on the basis of provinces? Fourth, has the Canadian Civil Liberties Union made any comments on the establishment of this group? Have civil libertarians in general brought their position to the attention of the minister?

Fifth, does the group investigate on its own initiative? Sixth, who has access to the files? Do other departments, for example, have access to the files of this division? Can these files be used as the basis for discrimination against individuals or groups applying for federal government jobs or grants in other fields? Seventh, I should also like to ask whether the subjects who are being investigated or evaluated are informed about this process. How long will this information stay in the records of this group for which the Solicitor General is responsible? Eighth, what kind of protection will be afforded to individuals or groups that potentially are being investigated. Ninth, was the justice department's advice solicited on the establishment of this security planning and research group or organization?

Tenth, will they share their files with the ministry of justice? Eleventh, how long will any investigation remain on file? Twelfth, I should like to ask if the advice of this group will transcend the advice of other divisions. Thirteenth, who gathers the information for this group to evaluate. Is it gathered by this particular group, is it gathered by the RCMP, and what are its terms of reference? Fourteenth, I should like to know how this group will make a distinction between anyone promoting social change and someone promoting subversion. My last and fifteenth question is, does this group intend to investigate individuals or groups regarding the objects of such individuals or groups who have received DREE grants, LIP grants or Opportunities for Youth grants which, after all, can be used and are being used in some cases for the promotion of social change?

It seems to me that there are so many questions that need to be answered about this group that it is time we paid more attention to the basis on which it has been set up and under which it operates. The minister's inordinate preoccupation with being secretive about this group probably is doing it a disservice and is perhaps hindering it from fulfilling the function for which it was formed.