

concept called extra parliamentary opposition was very much in evidence.

That brings me to the statement the Prime Minister made a few moments ago, as well on previous occasions, when he said the practice of surveillance has been going on for 30 years. But never before, under no other administration, was there a capacity within the Solicitor General's office of the type that we have now, the security and analysis group, which has access to these lists. As we all know, they have not only kept these lists for the purpose which was identified by the Solicitor General last Friday, but they have circulated these lists to other departments of government. These lists have become public knowledge.

When the President of Privy Council tells us that members of parliament should have no special privilege, he is very much confused. He says that members of parliament should not be on these lists but other people may. There are other lists which are made up of union leaders, when unions have been under surveillance, and native leaders who have been under surveillance. I could name these lists, but I do not intend to do so here. However, I will do so on another occasion. There has been surveillance of student leaders on campuses, and surveillance of public servants.

If one relates this situation to actual personalities there is the example of a person by the name of Walter Rudnicki, whose name happened to be on one of these lists. He is very much interested in the political process. He may want to offer his name to compete in an election. The question arises, what will happen when the police find his name on the list? Also, what will happen when they find his name on the list in which he was identified as a subversive, a person who by illegal and violent means wishes to overthrow this government? That is the difference to which we have to address ourselves.

● (1542)

We have here a unique opportunity to raise these matters which are very sensitive and crucial. In my case it has become a very emotional issue. I still today have information about some of these matters which I have not yet brought to the attention of the McDonald Royal Commission. I find it distasteful to bring this to the attention of the public, either in the House of Commons or outside.

I desperately want to be provided with a forum and an opportunity to tell all I know. What better time and way to do that than by an internal inquiry? If this matter is referred to the committee and the motion of the hon. member for Halifax is accepted, I suggest that some of the hearings and meetings might well be held in camera. People like myself and some of my colleagues could then bring these matters to the attention of our friends and colleagues in the House of Commons. We could once and for all take the necessary remedial actions and measures to clean up what I consider to be a very critical, distasteful, and ugly mess, a sort of monster which has the potential of becoming unmanageable. This should be done at the earliest possible opportunity.

Privilege—Mr. Stanfield

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct your attention to the principal issue before you, the question of whether the rights of members of parliament have been violated as a result of the release of this particular document. Surely the overwhelming fact is that a candidate and member of parliament are one and the same thing during the time that an election takes place.

If I could direct Your Honour's attention to that fact, that is prima facie evidence that the surveillance techniques were putting members of parliament under surveillance. Perhaps you might wish to argue about people who are not members of parliament, those who are merely candidates, and I do not say they should be put under surveillance, because they should not. The key issue is whether there is a prima facie case against members of parliament.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you direct your attention to the law, which is that a member of parliament continues to be a member of parliament after an election is called. Therefore, the documents that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) has referred to clearly refer to the surveillance of members of parliament.

We have ample precedent before us. That is the question which arose from the surveillance of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). The facts in that case were that a sworn affidavit by one Warren Hart said (a) "I was directed by the RCMP" and (b) "I placed the hon. member for Nickel Belt under surveillance." Therefore, that was found to be a prima facie case of an interference with the normal rights and privileges of a member of parliament.

In that case, as Your Honour so well put it, it was of such importance, with the new kinds of electronic techniques that have been developed, that Your Honour felt it was a matter that should be dealt with by the House. In that instance Your Honour saw fit to put the motion before the House. This House, to its eternal shame, turned down that motion. The Liberal whips got on the job and decided that the motion Your Honour decided to put before this House should not be referred to a committee.

I am willing to accept the assurances of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). That is my job as a member of parliament. However, I find it deeply suspicious, with a motion put in the circumstances which the hon. member for Nickel Belt was faced with, when this Liberal government, with some notable exceptions I see who are here, would not allow an inquiry, even an inquiry to determine whether his rights had been violated.

We heard some rhetoric from the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) on Friday, rhetoric about members of parliament seeking to expand their rights as a result of this. The rights of a member of parliament are traditional, to protect his constituents from oppression. The rights of a member of parliament are a direct result of an attempt by a democracy to protect itself from the agents of the Crown. That is what the rights of a member of parliament are all about.

No one is standing in this House trying to expand the rights of a member of parliament on some kind of personal basis. We