

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS



AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES

PDM (Through PDF)

FROM  
DeREFERENCE  
RéférenceSUBJECT  
Sujet

PSP/A.F. Hart/cmd

Mr. Eric Nielsen's Parliamentary Question  
No. 1849 of April 3, 1973.SECURITY  
Sécurité

DATE

NUMBER  
Numéro

FILE

OTTAWA

MISSION

DOSSIER

ENCLOSURES  
Annexes

- 2 -

DISTRIBUTION

On the basis of contributions from all those concerned, Mr. Luyendyk, Privy Council Office, has prepared the attached reply to Mr. Nielsen's twenty-nine questions.

2. As you know, Mr. Nielsen's main thrust was at the Police and Security Planning and Analysis Group (PSPG) in the Solicitor General's Department. His questions reflect an apparent concern that this group may be handling information on members of political parties and, usurping the functions of the RCMP, may be involved in personal security clearances and investigative action related to such matters. Enough information is provided in the response to show that this concern is unjustified, but Mr. Nielsen may of course take a different view. He is reported in the Globe and Mail this morning as saying that he would submit more questions if the present ones on the order paper are not answered. Two other comments attributed to him in the same report are (a) he had discovered (presumably as a result of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee meeting he had attended yesterday) that some of the long series of questions would breach national security if they were answered in public and (b) he submitted some of his questions knowing that they would not be answered just to show the Government the extent of his knowledge.

3. As the Prime Minister wishes to make the response to Mr. Nielsen in as low a key as possible, there will be no oral statement accompanying the written response. While the intention has been to keep answers to questions as brief and as general as possible, in fact it has been found possible to provide a fair amount of information. However, on matters of security policy, practices and procedures, the information provided does not really go beyond that contained in the statements made by Mr. Pearson and Mr. Chevrier in the House of Commons on October 25, 1963 (a copy of their statement is attached).

4. In some areas answers are avoided on the grounds that the information requested is not returnable for reasons of national security. This is the case with questions 6, 19(b), 22, 23 and 24 which posed questions about the membership and responsibilities of the Inter-departmental Committee on Security and Intelligence, the Intelligence Advisory Committee, and the Security Advisory Committee. One aim here is to avoid affording a basis for further questions which might seek to include a more searching examination of the Canadian intelligence programme and the responsibilities of the various agencies and departments in this field.

.../2 A0050249\_1-001718

CONFIDENTIAL

5. Answers are either avoided or only partially dealt with in the case of questions 9, 17 and 26. Question 9 seeks to elicit information on organizations or groups, including labour unions, which might be the subject of study by PSPG because they are suspected or categorized as subversive. Question 26 enquires whether the Security Advisory Committee has developed a sky-jacking policy, contingency plans to meet an insurrection in Quebec, plans to break the Quebec labour union, and a scheme to utilize the central telephone system in Ottawa to keep under surveillance all telephones in Ottawa. Question 17 raises a number of enquiries about Lt. Col. Dabros of PSPG, one of them implying that there exists a previous medical history on him. This particular question drew press criticism of Mr. Nielsen, notably an article by Denis Foley in the Ottawa Citizen of April 5. In reaction Mr. Allmand, the Solicitor General, sent a letter to the Citizen, published on April 13, defending Lt. Col. Dabros' record and stating categorically that he had never been under the care or treatment of a psychiatrist. At about the same time the Department of National Defence announced his promotion to the rank of Colonel and his appointment as Director of Security in that Department. In fact Mr. Allmand's letter to the Citizen contained somewhat more information on Col. Dabros than is provided in the attached reply. I understand, however, that this reflects Mr. Cloutier's strongly held view that Mr. Nielsen should be given as little information as possible on this subject.

6. There are references to two members of the Department: to Mr. Côté in question 12 and to myself in question 23(b). The question on Mr. Côté is answered directly. The question concerning myself is side-stepped because it deals with a function on the Intelligence Advisory Committee.

7. In general there seems little or no need for us to comment on the substance of the proposed reply as it now stands. I have suggested to Mr. Luyendyk that the answer to 6(e) needs to be reconciled with the response under 3(a), (b) and (c). This he would propose to do by adding to 6(e) something along the following lines: "except for the special provision made under the review procedure outlined in the answers to 3(a), (b) and (c)".

8. You may wish to consider whether the attached final draft should be shown to the Minister. Subject to any further comments our Department and other departments concerned may wish to make, the draft will be cleared with Mr. Robertson and then submitted to Mr. MacEachen and the Prime Minister.



A.F. HART,  
Director-General,  
Bureau of Security and Intelligence  
Liaison A0050249\_2-001719