Criminal Code

man. I say "No!". Things have to be made clear, we will have to select our bills. When we are dealing with such a matter, a matter that has been dealt with in committee, this government should take the reports of this committee and study them.

We were talking a moment ago about these remarkable committees and the job they are doing. However, notwithstanding piles and piles of reports, not a word has been changed. In fact, 39 motions have been proposed in this House and all of them have been rejected. Government officials have told the minister: "That is what you should do. It is going to be this way, Okay!" So what is the use of working in a committee. I am not going to work there any more. It is hard and it is ridiculous. Look at what happened last week. If any average citizen had seen that, he would have thought that we are worse than children.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we should absolutely oblige this government to introduce real legislation instead of omnibus bills, legislation about precise matters we will be able to discuss thoroughly and especially, instead of listening to technocrats, they should read and consider the reports of the committees hearings. I think from there we will be able to work seriously, instead of referring the case from Caiaphas to Pilate, as it is the case now, so that we do not know who is responsible for whom and for what.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if we do not do that, if we go on proposing such mixture to the people, they are not going to consider us as serious legislators. As for me, I cannot vote for this bill in its present form. There are some good things in there, but, in its present form, I cannot swallow the whole thing. That is what I wanted to say to support the motion of the hon. member from the New Democratic Party.

● (1620)

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I intend only to make a few brief remarks. I join with the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) in expressing my protest at the way this bill has been introduced. To me it is an abuse of parliament to bring in a bill which has two parts, one having no connection with the other, and to ask the House to vote on them in a kind of package. What are we supposed to do? I had always understood that we voted according to our conscience, but in one part of this so-called package there is one measure we would like to vote for, however weak the gun control aspect of the bill may be. I should like to support it as a gesture, to indicate that there must be some stop put to the use of guns for violent purposes, that the picture must change.

I have tried to support the right to privacy of individuals in society, but I have no intention whatever of voting for a bill which includes these offensive provisions in regard to wiretapping. In the article quoted by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands which I think was printed in the *Globe and Mail* a few days ago, Tom Wicker quotes one of the greatest judges in the history of this continent, Mr. Justice Holmes. He described wiretapping and bugging as "a dirty

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

business". Mr. Wicker, who is a distinguished journalist, comments "and so it has proved".

I am not going into this aspect of the bill in detail. If it were effective, if the minister had brought in any evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of this method of apprehending criminals, we might have to take a different view. But no such evidence exists. In fact, nearly all the evidence is precisely to the contrary. Therefore, we are invading the right to privacy of individuals for no good purpose whatever. I suppose the reason for bringing forward this legislation is to please the police. I regard the police, as I imagine every member does, as being a very important element of our society, with a very important task to perform. But one task the police do not perform is the making of the laws of this country. I regard the subservience of the minister to the point of view of the police as something that is highly unsatisfactory and wrong.

I have had occasion in the last few weeks to wonder why the party opposite calls itself the Liberal party of Canada. I cannot think of anything less liberal than the way they have approached some of these matters. I was on the immigration committee where they put in a platoon system, and people who had not even heard the evidence voted down nearly all the constructive suggestions which were made. Personally, I would be ashamed if I were minister of justice in a so-called Liberal cabinet and I brought in this regressive, backward piece of legislation dealing with wiretapping which, as I say, infringes basic human rights.

I have said what I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. I hope I have said it clearly and that at some stage or other the minister will start paying attention to the decencies of parliamentary life.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) to refer back to committee those clauses dealing with wiretapping. Every single day brings new insights into the whole question of wiretapping and the broadening of such powers which we are permitting in this bill. Personally, if I had my preference I would outlaw wiretapping and bugging by anyone, including the police and the law enforcement agencies.

I think the minister should be aware of the latest disturbing news, which is that Securicom of Canada Limited, a company which is an expert on debugging and specializes in locating bugs in rooms and on telephones, has been in communication with and offered a position to J. Gordon Liddy, a convicted criminal in the United States. I do not know how he will get by the Manpower department. The department will probably give this chap a work permit, with one million Canadians out of work, and he will be engaged in this very surreptitious business of working for Securicom detecting bugs and other listening devices.

Mr. Paproski: There are a lot of bugs in the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member says—