

The hon. member went on to say that it is up to the McDonald commission to settle this question. It is not up to the McDonald commission. The McDonald commission will never settle the question for me. I will read their report to see whether I think it is valuable or makes sense. To say that the McDonald commission will settle the question is ridiculous. We are going to settle the question, if we are re-elected. Those of us who will be here in one or two years' time, if that royal commission ever finishes its work, and it is a pretty slow commission proceeding at a pretty slow pace, will decide the issue in this House, not the McDonald Royal Commission. While we are waiting to be guided by the McDonald commission, we only have to say we are disappointed at a lack of progress to date.

For the government to have the gall to come in with this legislation in view of the record that has been revealed since the last solicitor general spoke in this House last October is most surprising. The McDonald royal commission was announced last October 27.

**An hon. Member:** It was in June.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Was it in June? I thought the statement was in October. Their terms of reference were widened in October. The hon. member is correct, it was last June.

We have had questions about former solicitors general, who are still members of this House, for the past year or two on past issues that affect the McDonald commission and the Keable commission. Instead of the government and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) insisting that they be first before that commission to clear their names and clear up all the confusion, they have been hiding out ever since that commission has been appointed.

We have been told by the McDonald commission they are not going to start questioning people like that until next summer. If that is not a cover-up, I do not know what is. If I were in the position of either one of those two gentlemen, I would insist to Judge McDonald that I appear before the commission now, under oath, to explain and clear up the discrepancy, and not month after month sit like a dummy.

We have a mummies troupe now at the National Arts Centre which is presenting "They Club Seals, Don't They?" I would like to have them cut loose in here and club some sense into the government. They are called The Mummies Troupe. The Mummies Troupe should be joined by the government because they are mummies also. They are mum. To be mum means to say nothing, to keep quiet, to cover up, to hide.

The government is the mummies troupe. They should all troup over to the Arts Centre and join the Mummies Troupe tonight and do something useful instead of the positively harmful things they are now doing to Canada, such as bringing in legislation like this.

The time of the present Solicitor General will be short. He may as well go over and join the Mummies. In fact, he was the original mummer. He was not going to answer any questions.

### *Criminal Code*

He was murn, mum, mum. He was so mum, he was a mummy. He is in the long history of the Egyptian mummy.

Let us look at this piece of legislation.

**Mr. Lachance:** It's about time; you have already taken 15 minutes.

**Mr. Crosbie:** You do not have to stay here. You can leave if you are not interested. This is the report that has to be filed under the Official Secrets Act if it is a national security matter under Section 16(5) about interceptions, whether they be telephone interceptions or mail interceptions. God knows what other kind of interceptions go on, hidden by the Official Secrets Act. It is one skimpy page. It tells you nothing. There were 471 warrants issued for an average of 244 days. The methods were wiretapping and eaves dropping by microphone. One warrant authorized interception of a written communiqué. It goes on with a pansy little statement about the warrants being very valuable in detecting subversive activities, and so on. It is only one page. It is nothing. That is what we get under the Official Secrets Act. The Solicitor General has full power, but reports nothing to the House.

Under the privacy legislation, another report has to be made to do with wiretapping under the Criminal Code. That is a 21 page report. There is not all that much more information in it, but at least you can see how many warrants were issued, how many led to a charge being laid, and how many charges were successfully prosecuted. That is shown in this 21 page report.

In the legislation now before us, the only kind of report we will get about the mail is this spindly little thing, this wizened, weak nothing, that tells us nothing and tells the country nothing. That is all we are going to get under this legislation. That is the only safeguard we have.

*The Globe and Mail* had an editorial on Thursday, February 9, that made a lot of sense. It pointed out that with respect to wiretapping and the parts of this bill under the Narcotics Control Act where it is necessary to make reports and go to judge, and I quote:

—the protections are largely illusory.

I agree with that. When discussing the national security part of this, it goes on to state:

Warrants empowering police to intercept or open mail under the Official Secrets Act would not require the sanction of a judge; they would be issued by the Solicitor General of Canada. People whose mail had been opened on the authority of such a warrant would not have to be told that their mail had been opened. Their mail could be opened even though neither the Solicitor General nor the police—nor anyone else—had any grounds even to suspect that a crime were being committed or contemplated. It would all be done in the interest of (that term again) national security, the prevention of "subversive activity".

What constitutes subversive activity? The definition, and the scope of the definition, will change from day to day, will change according to the political and social mood of the times, will vary according to the political insecurity of the government in power.

If the present government's proposed legislation becomes law, then private mail could be opened with no one save the police and the government permitted to know whose mail had been opened or what it contained. This is not what we consider to be law geared solely for the protection of the public from