

area handle their guns carefully because they use them. It is not unusual to go into a house in many small communities and see four or five guns hanging on the livingroom wall. The people think they are very nice.

Guns are very elaborate pieces of machinery. A number of people who were watching the news the other night saw that the mayor of one city has gathered up all the guns. They put them in a bucket and grind them up. That shocks me, actually, because some guns are beautiful pieces of workmanship. Many of them are as difficult to repair as a watch, and not many of us are competent to do that. But that is not to say that they are not dangerous. I am sometimes shocked at the insensitivity of my colleagues who like to see the destruction of guns which to many people are very valuable.

● (2140)

I do not want to speak for very long, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say I am surprised at my colleagues who have not been vocal in their defence of the differences that exist in this country between various regions. We talk today about Quebec and its language being different from the rest of Canada. We talk about western Canada being different from the rest of the country because it grows grain. There is also a big difference between major urban centres and rural areas in the matter of guns.

I agree with people in the city of Toronto who say that a gun in the average apartment is purchased only for shooting people. Many of these people never get the opportunity to do anything else with a gun. They keep it for what they call defence, and that is defence against people. In my area it is used as a defence against the elements. Some members say they use a gun to shoot bears and wolves, but that does not often happen. But we who live in rural areas train our young people to use a gun for that purpose; we do not keep them for shooting people. So there again there is a difference. I am surprised at the insensitivity of many members of this House who support law and order but who are not willing to reflect the opinion expressed by many of those who live beyond the urban fringe and the "Golden Horseshoe."

I hope that when the bill goes to committee we will have an opportunity to state our position on wiretapping and on other parts of the bill, but I would not like it to pass second reading without having had an opportunity to put forward my northern views on this important subject.

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I am only going to speak for a few moments this evening, and it is very painful for me to have to admit that. However, we do want to have a vote tonight so I am going to take just five minutes to put on the record for the first time my views about wiretapping, which is all I shall address myself to now.

I am surprised and amazed that a government which is supposed to be headed by a great libertarian, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), would bring in a bill like this which would allow wiretapping with no notice being given the person being wiretapped for three years if a judge sees fit so to

Criminal Code

approve. Well, there are judges and judges. There are judges who are great upholders of the prosecutorial process. As one hon. member said this evening, there has not been one instance of a wiretapping application being turned down, according to the records filed for last year.

I am certainly against any widening of the law applying to wiretapping, any extension of the 90 period to three years, or even to 91 days or 100 days. The Prime Minister made his reputation on stating that the state should not intrude in the bedrooms of the nation; this was in 1968, or whenever it was he was justice minister. His government is now bringing in a bill like this, a Liberal bill, extending the powers of the police and the government to wiretap private citizens. I am unalterably opposed to that. If the state should not be in the bedrooms of the nation, I see no reason why the state should be able to wiretap the bedsprings of the nation, because that is what they can do, Mr. Speaker, under this piece of legislation. I do not believe in wiretapping.

When the justice minister spoke the other day he gave the usual false reason. He gave the usual reassurance to the ordinary citizen which is always dragged up. Whether it is Senator Foghorn in the United States or the Minister of Justice of Canada, the same old excuse is always given—I refer to *Hansard* for May 11—namely, that the activities of the bosses of organized crime can be more effectively investigated by wiretapping than is possible at present. I say piffle! That has nothing to do with it. At least, wiretapping has only slightly to do with the bosses of organized crime. It is the ordinary people of this country who can be wiretapped, yet we always hear this talk about the bosses of organized crime. When we hear about wiretapping we all get this vision about the Mafia, that only the Mafia is being wiretapped, and therefore it is all right for us to approve anything that the Crown wants to introduce in order to catch the Mafia or the people who were on television in Montreal a few months ago. Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not wash.

The two or three hundred wiretaps which went on last year were not all of people involved in organized crime. I am irretrievably opposed to the use of evidence obtained through illegal wiretaps. We should follow the United States precedent, not the English. I do not care whether the evidence is relevant or irrelevant; if it is obtained by illegal means it should be blocked from the courts. If we do not block it from the courts we are only giving the police and RCMP the incentive to obtain evidence by illegal means. If they know it can be used in court in any event they are not going to worry too much about the means. That is an inconsistency, and I hope to have a chance to vote against it.

I am also completely opposed to wiretapping of solicitors. I do not care if somebody persuades a judge that a solicitor or a lawyer may be involved in a crime. It is an absolute infringement upon our system of civil liberty to place a wiretap on a lawyer, or in his office, or anywhere near his place of business. You can do the same in his home as you can do in other people's homes if the law so permits, but to wiretap conversations between solicitor and client is absolutely abhorrent and