

*Oral Questions*

## EXTRAPARLIAMENTARY OPPOSITION LISTS

Second, how can such destruction take place without either a certificate of destruction or some record of destruction that would be immediately available to the Solicitor General?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows I replied to a question on the order paper relating to the destruction of records within the RCMP. I advised the House at that time there is no statutory requirement to keep any records of the destruction. I explained quite extensively the process that was followed in the destruction of these documents.

**Mr. Jarvis:** To say the least, it is alarming that, regardless of the statutory requirement, any solicitor general would not want to know when records of such a vital nature are destroyed. Yesterday the Solicitor General said the directives were fairly explicit that this type of report be destroyed after three years, but the reports for 1973, 1974 and part of 1975 were not destroyed because of the establishment of the McDonald commission.

I point out as a matter of arithmetic that the McDonald commission was established in mid-1977. Therefore, we have at least 18 of these monthly reports which miraculously are available subsequent to the tenure of the present Minister of Supply and Services which must have been retained in contradiction of these fairly explicit directives. Why can we get the documents for 1973 and half of 1974 but we cannot get the documents which predate those?

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, the documents themselves are the subject of destruction, as the hon. member has said. The McDonald inquiry was not formed until 1977. Indeed, there was an explicit order issued by my predecessor that no further documents should be destroyed which could be material to the McDonald inquiry. That order was followed. If the hon. member has any knowledge of large administrations, he will know that sometimes explicit directives are not followed explicitly.

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

**Mr. Jarvis:** Is the Solicitor General telling us that his immediate predecessor found out about this destruction and ordered it to stop with the 1973 reports? If I understood him correctly, he said that a counter order to the explicit directive was issued by his predecessor. Will he tell the House now whether his predecessor found out about the 1971 and 1972 destruction? If so, when did he find it out, and as a result of finding it out did he order such destruction to stop?

**Mr. Blais:** No, Mr. Speaker, I believe the order was a more general one, not directed to any specific event but just to ensure that all evidence was made available. Questions were asked of my predecessor in this House relating to destruction policies by, I believe, the hon. member for New Westminster. At that time, the then solicitor general indicated that he had issued an order that no further document be destroyed notwithstanding the directives contained within the administration itself.

**Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General. Since it was the practice in the crucial 24-month extraparliamentary period for which these surveillance reports are missing to compile lists called extraparliamentary opposition lists, can the minister tell us the connection between the extraparliamentary opposition lists and the surveillance reports? Also, are these lists still with the security analysis group, in his office at this time, or have they been destroyed? Further, were the people who were innocent and named in those lists notified and offered redress?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has directed a very involved and complex question to me: there was an indication that somehow the extraparliamentary opposition lists were connected with these documents. I want to assure the hon. member that there is no connection.

\* \* \*

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

CANADA-U.S. AUTO PACT—SUGGESTED CANADIAN  
AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister: it is a return to questions on the Canada-U.S. auto agreement and why the government has failed to ensure that we get a proper proportion of jobs from it. The minister, in replying, said the Americans probably think it is too good for Canada. That is very likely true, given the fact that we have not been doing very much bargaining, and bearing in mind the government's defeatist attitude.

● (1202)

In order to ascertain government policy, I should like to put this question to the Deputy Prime Minister: Is there an alternative plan within the government to develop a national automobile industry if we do not get our fair share of jobs from the Canada-U.S. auto agreement?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** The hon. gentleman's question is hypothetical, but I understand its implications. I gather he is recommending that we do away with the idea of a North American market for Canadian production and employment. That seems to me to be a somewhat unusual proposal.

**Mr. Saltsman:** Mr. Speaker, I hope I will be excused if I do not make recommendations to the government, since ministers do not seem to pick them up. The Deputy Prime Minister paid attention to only part of what I was saying. The fact that at present the government has no alternative to the auto agreement simply means that the Americans can thumb their noses at this country because we have no bargaining position. I am asking the Deputy Prime Minister whether we are prepared to go on our own with a national auto industry should we fail to get our fair share of jobs out of the auto agreement.