mass of previously confidential information to be made public will be sorely disappointed because that is not the case.

I would like to give an example of that. In September of 1980, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gave instructions to all ministers to respond as if the Freedom of Information Act was in effect. They were to respond as if that act was in effect and to answer requests for information from journalists, Members of Parliament or other individuals. It has been two years now. Journalists would be able to attest to the fact that things have not changed very much. How much new information have we had access to in the last two years, supposedly when the government has been operating as if this bill were in effect? It has been a trickle and perhaps nothing at all.

We had one hope that perhaps the offensive Section 41(2) of the Federal Court Act might not be invoked, but we have seen that even that section has been invoked on a number of occasions by the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan).

I suggest that the exemptions in this bill are so broadly worded that they basically amount to a licence to conceal information whether under federal-provincial affairs, exemptions on subversive and hostile activities which was heavily criticized by the McDonald Commission, the exemption respecting law enforcement investigation which effectively denies any access to information about the activities of the RCMP security service or the new civilian security service, and even fundamental information such as the size of that service and its mandate. As well, there is the clause respecting economic interests and the sweeping provisions on third party information.

There are those provisions in the bill relating to government operations which means that we will, in effect, know nothing more than the government already wants us to know, except perhaps for some information of historical significance.

The judicial review provisions basically amount to a second class form of judicial review and not at all the *de novo* review on the merits that the minister promised on second reading. The amendments to this legislation which watered down Clauses 50 and 51 that relate to judicial review by changing the word "entitlement" to "authorized" weaken those sections of the bill considerably.

Surely the most offensive amendment of all is the one that was inserted during the dying hours of committee deliberations. That is the amendment respecting Crown privilege. We now have a situation where the government or a minister simply has to stamp a document as being the confidence of the Queen's Privy Council and that is the end of the matter. There is no opportunity for judicial review and no opportunity for the courts to determine that, in fact, there has not been an abuse of this provision. This gaping hole in the bill effectively means that the government is asking us to trust that it will not abuse its right to conceal information.

In my view, the record of this government certainly leaves a great deal to be desired when it asks us to trust it. In my opinion, this amendment has dealt a body blow—a fatal blow—to a bill which was already weak in many areas. The government has bowed to the advocates of secrecy, among them the Prime Minister and the Clerk of the Privy Council, Michael Pitfield, and the doors remain tightly shut.

I noted with interest that the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton indicated that his party would be supporting this bill on third reading. I find that rather incongruous in view of the fact he is quoted as saying in the committee that this particular clause gutted judicial review, as indeed it did. He went on to say that judicial review is, in fact, the cornerstone of this bill. If the cornerstone of this bill has been removed, how can any party in the House that genuinely believes in freedom of information support the bill after such a weakening?

In the remaining minutes I have I would like to turn to the privacy act portion and the provisions of this legislation which allegedly protects the privacy of Canadians. In my view, this part of the bill is nothing less than a giant con job on Canadians. Far from protecting the privacy of Canadians, far from protecting intrusion into the private lives of Canadians, this part of the bill amounts to nothing less than an attack on their privacy. If anything, I suggest it should be called an attack on privacy act, instead of protection of privacy act.

This portion of the bill should have been separated, as was urged by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and other witnesses. Instead, we were asked to swallow the entire package. While I do not intend to go into the weaknesses of this privacy act in depth, I would note that there is no doubt whatsoever that this bill gives sweeping new powers to the heads of government institutions and to the RCMP and the new civilian security service in particular to intrude into the most confidential and personal aspects of the lives of Canadians.

The existing provisions that protect the privacy of Canadians which are contained in Part IV of the Canadian Human Rights Act are being repealed. In their place we have a so-called privacy act which has been severely condemned by the McDonald Commission, which was prepared to concede a great deal in terms of powers to the government, under normal circumstances. The commission said this about Bill C-43:

> The legislation does not provide a clear enough test of necessity for access to personal information for security intelligence purposes. It leaves the prior approval of all access, including access to details of a person's life far beyond what is needed for the purposes of identification, to Ministers, and it provides no role in approving requests for information to the Minister responsible for the security intelligence agency.

The McDonald Commission points out that at the present time the RCMP security service and the criminal investigation side of the force have been denied access to virtually all personal information possessed by other federal government institutions. Of course, I emphasize "denied legal access". We all know the record of abuse of power that has taken place and which was documented by the McDonald Commission. The present commissioner of the RCMP has said that he believes that the RCMP need the right to break the law.

I realize that my time is running out, but perhaps I might seek the indulgence of the House for another few minutes.