

insurrection", there were no new instructions given to the security forces on which they thereupon acted, not an isolated incident but a series of events which are now being reported almost daily.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I answered earlier that after the events of October, 1970 we obviously did have meetings with the security branch of the RCMP, and we indicated to that branch that we would appreciate it very much indeed if it would concentrate a little bit more on getting information on the security side about those within Canada who might resort to illegal acts in order to break up our democratic country. Therefore, there were these meetings. We met with the police periodically. I could not give the exact number of times or the dates. We met with them to receive information from them about different groups which had to be put under surveillance. We met to give the police directives of a general nature, that they should perhaps be operating more in this direction or that direction. Very often these meetings were meant to brief us on specific people they had detected exchanging official secrets, and that resulted, as I said earlier, in the declaration of those particular persons to be *persona non grata* in Canada.

There was a whole series of meetings, the purpose of which was to receive from the security service information and to convey to it in general terms the desires of the cabinet of the day and its general directions so that the police in a sense could be controlled and told what areas they should be more particularly concerned about. This whole area is, once again, where we are constantly faced with the dilemma of how far a security service must go while at the same time respecting the rights of the individual and ensuring the security of the state. It is a dilemma that any police force faces. I see that the Leader of the Opposition is shaking his head. I am sure he could face the dilemma with a great deal of ease.

**Mr. Clark:** I am incredulous.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I have invited him, as I invited his predecessor, if he wants to be party to these security briefings, to be party to them. I have written to that effect, and I wrote to his predecessor in office to that effect.

**Mr. Clark:** Not to those briefings.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** That is a distortion; you have not.

**Mr. Clark:** I am sure you would want to set the record straight.

**Mr. Lawrence:** You surely do need help.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** The record is quite straight. I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition telling him that if he wanted to be party to security briefings by our security service, we would very gladly arrange such briefings.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister seems either unwilling or unable to clarify his responsibility in the cabinet committee on security and intelligence. I wonder if he can indicate whether in the enumeration of these investigations or in the work that was to be carried out following the events of the fall of 1970 any distinction was drawn between associations, groups or political parties which might have views different from those of the Prime Minister and his government and those who were prepared to resort to violence and whether there was any requirement established or any direction given with respect to what would be proper in terms of investigation proceedings, because what we are dealing with here is not investigation but in effect new forms of illegal acts, if not some kind of counter-subversion, on behalf of the security forces.

**Mr. Trudeau:** That seems to be a repetition of the same question about directives. I repeat that the directives were to find out more about those within Canada who for ideological reasons would destroy this country. Those were the directives, and they were followed as best they could be followed by a police force which sometimes makes mistakes, but which basically has helped this country a great deal in the past and will in the future.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### BASIS ON WHICH SECURITY OPERATIONS CONDUCTED— INQUIRY AS TO PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether I am to understand that he is today rejecting the doctrine that the then solicitor general quoted in the House, with approval, when he was establishing the security and research planning group on September 21, 1971 when he quoted the following:

I am sure that members of parliament accept the necessity that much of the security operation is conducted outside our purview. What would be cause for grave concern would be any thought that much of the operation is beyond the ken of the ministry or the Prime Minister; that there are not ministers, elective and responsible members of government to whom the entire security operation is an open book, who have continuing access to everything that is going on in that area, and who give proper, responsible, political, civilian direction to the operation on a continuing basis.

● (1502)

That is the basis on which the then Solicitor General presented that organization to us in 1971. Am I correct in understanding that the Prime Minister is now rejecting that document?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax has read a long quotation which I understand is from the then solicitor general.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Quoting me.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, there is a quotation of the hon. member for Halifax by the then solicitor general. It is a long one and I cannot say in totality if I—

**Miss MacDonald:** You cannot understand it.