

opinion that it would be better to make these wire taps subject to judicial control.

This particular point is made at page 563 of the same issue of *Votes and Proceedings* as I alluded to earlier, under the heading "The Choice between a Responsible Minister and a Court".

Testimony before the Committee has been divided on the issue of whether the authorization to intercept communications should be granted by a judge, by a Minister, or by some combination of the two. In the United Kingdom, authorization is granted by a Minister, without, however, any political or public visibility. In the United States, authorization is granted by a judge upon application by a prosecuting attorney, with political and public visibility. Having considered the alternatives, a majority of the Committee has decided to recommend that the decision to apply for authority to intercept communications should be made by a responsible Minister of the Crown, based upon a request to the Minister by law enforcement agencies. The responsibility for the decision as to whether or not the request for authorization to intercept communications should be granted should be vested in a judge of a superior court of criminal jurisdiction.

This is the decision the government has taken, and I think it is a wise one. It will undoubtedly save a lot of flak when this measure is considered in committee. If the bill has any defects, they are as follows: it does not deal with the vast amount of technological data which has been assembled, or is being assembled on most of us in Canada, and it does not deal with the question of governmental surveillance. These details have been noted by others, so I do not press them particularly, though I would note a speech made by one of the leading bureaucrats, a former member of the Parliamentary Press Gallery, Mr. Richard Gwyn, delivered to the 47th Annual Couchiching Conference at Geneva Park in August, 1971. Mr. Gwyn, who is a director of the Communications Department's socio-economic planning branch, stated that the government collects far more data than it needs on individuals and that the handling of this data was often sloppy. There was, he said, "a vast wash of information about individuals floating about Ottawa". Later he stated, according to the report which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on August 7, 1971:

It cannot be safely said that computers are only tools in the hands of human beings who make the decisions. I am more convinced of the possibility that machines do change our environment and do change the nature of decisions, limit the nature of the changes, emphasize some and deemphasize others that we are able to make.

Computers, he went on to say, would demolish the usual safeguard of inefficiency in the manual handling of files. He added:

Government inefficiency has always been one of the great protectors of civil liberties. Civil servants will not give up their data banks to each other.

So, with the advent of increased efficiency we lose some of the protection we enjoy against governments. This illustrates the point I am making that we are still not dealing with the subject from the point of view of the vast amount of technology which directly affects citizens and what can be done to protect the right of individual privacy from wrongful use of such data. This point has been pursued vigorously, so far without success, by the civil liberties section of the Canadian Bar Association. For example, in September, 1970, in Halifax, it adopted section 1, on the right of a citizen to privacy, which provided

Protection of Privacy Bill

that the individual should, by law, have some control over information passed on about him by credit agents and other bodies. That group also sought regulation of private detective agencies, credit bodies and other groups which keep files on individuals.

• (1610)

One of the strong points made by the civil liberties section was the right of a citizen to inspect any file compiled on him, to challenge incorrect information and require that it be corrected, and to sue any person who supplied false information. In that respect, our law is still deficient and we are still, each and every last one of us, at the mercy of sleuths who may not do an efficient job and may incorrectly report some circumstance about us, which is compiled somewhere and which may be to our detriment at some future date.

There is considerable sophistication in the communications world today. I was intrigued by seven or eight recent developments in this field. They were considered at a meeting organized by the Council of Europe in Brussels, Belgium, about a year or so ago. Some eight of them appealed to me as examples of the sophisticated devices that can and perhaps do operate in Canada and elsewhere. One of these was the harmonica bug which can be placed in your telephone and relay conversations over thousands of miles. The bug is activated by the simple process of the eavesdropper dialing the victim's phone number and blowing a predetermined note on the harmonica. This prevents the phone from ringing and enables that bug in that phone to pick up and transmit any conversations in the room. This is fascinating.

Then, there is the bumper beeper. We have all seen these used in the chases that take place in the plethora of detective programs on television, so I will not bother going into that. There is a third one, however, a development for tracking individuals by radar. It is said, however, that this may have some entertainment value but not likely to have much detecting value, since the doppler system, as it is called, can distinguish women from men by the swing of their buttocks. I simply mention this as a bit of a novelty, and I would not want to give away any of the secrets of the attractiveness of the female sex, as obviously the doppler system has a great deal to do with it. I invite members interested in that point to pursue it further in textbooks on physics.

There is another device which can turn ordinary windowpanes into snooping devices by using a laser beam to monitor vibrations on the glass from sound waves inside the room. There is another device so intricate that even in very large buildings such as this, it can determine, on which side of the building an individual is walking by the tilt of the building. You do not have to be in the leaning tower of Pisa to know the tilt of a building. There is another highly sensitive thermal detector which can discover where a person has been sitting in a room simply by measuring the infinitesimal degree of difference in heat. One could pursue this subject much further, but I have only two more points to make in this regard.

There is a machine now being tested on animals which sends signals to electrodes implanted in the brain which can have an effect on the animal's behaviour. This can