

are espousing, or a particular objective they are pursuing, that they will destroy the rights and privileges of others. One of the roles which parliament has performed for centuries at Westminster and for the last 110 years in this country is to see to it that too much power is never concentrated in the hands of any person or groups of persons and that no institution, even a police force, is allowed to become a state within a state, possessing powers which will allow it to sweep aside the rights of other people. That is what this battle is all about.

The government brings in a measure of this kind in the dying days of the session, though we ought to have an opportunity to debate it at much greater length. But there is no need to exhaust hon. members. The government is aware of the position we take. The country, too, knows our position. I want those interested to know that as far as the NDP is concerned we would vote for the other part of the legislation provided for in Bill C-51. But we shall not vote for a bill which contains provisions approving not only electronic surveillance but the right of the police to commit criminal acts and, going even further, allows them to use in court the evidence which they have secured by this method. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and by substituting the following words:

"Bill C-51 be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering clauses 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 thereof.

● (1610)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I was hoping this afternoon to speak on Bill C-51 generally, but as this amendment has just been moved, I merely wish to say a few words in its support since it is asking that the bill should not be read for the third time, but that it be referred to the committee for a more thorough consideration and I would add to elucidate its contents.

We are told in the House that since this government is in power, we only see those omnibus bills designed to make us take poison coated with chocolate. It is always the same thing with those omnibus bills and this is why we will never accept them, despite the fact that they have been introduced for many years. Afterwards, during the election campaign we are told that we have voted for or against it. There are fine provisions in an omnibus bill, but there are also some bad ones. There are some things that we cannot accept, but by refusing the omnibus bill to oppose the bad provisions, we oppose the good ones as well. The government knows that very well, rather, the officials know it very well, because they are the ones who prepare this kind of bills. Someone said a little while ago that after ten years in power any government is corrupt, I say that after ten years in the administration, an official is just as corrupt as the government. That is why bills like this one are prepared by only one official, and he is doing it for fifteen or twenty years, he is the only one able to put out such a sordid thing. Only officials can do a thing like that.

*Criminal Code*

It is not the minister who has been in charge of this portfolio for only one or two years who understands all these tricks, but his high ranking officials. We are being administered and directed by these technocrats, with the consequences that we know today. The government relies on these technocrats, because they are helping it gain power. A party should not seek and hold power with means such as these, with all sorts of hypocrisies; it should tell the truth to the public, because the public wants it.

The government would like us to swallow the wiretapping issue; as a matter of fact, it should have introduced not one, but four different bills, so we could deal with the gun issue separately from the wiretapping issue. By the way, I am always surprised to read subclauses such as this allowing the wiretapping procedure. Yet, the Prime Minister himself claimed during his first term in office that he was the champion of human rights. Incidentally, he said—when we were talking about homosexuals—that we had no business in the bedrooms of the nation. But what kind of authorization is he going to give to the police? That of searching everywhere, of wiretapping everywhere, to know what is going on, and not always in accordance with the law, Mr. Speaker, as we have seen in recent weeks. The RCMP admitted that it did not always have a legal warrant. We must not forget that wiretapping is a very delicate matter.

In the light of what we are being told these days I don't think I can trust anyone anymore. The RCMP has always been considered as one of the most honest police forces. But when we see what is going on these days, we cannot help wondering where Canada is heading, when a government such as this is giving all sorts of permission because it is in power. If such is the price of power, Mr. Speaker, I would rather not have it. Our laws should at least provide for more morality, integrity and sincerity:

I think this is a complete reshaping of justice, and not another intrusion in the life of honest people, on a plea of trying to denounce, to find a criminal. But there are other means to find criminals, Mr. Speaker, if the police really wants to do so. But on the pretext of finding a criminal, we search into the life of honest people, to know what happens in their homes, in the small community where they live.

This is what we have to prevent, this is what we think about when we see pieces of legislation as permissive as this one. I always see intrusions here in my province, in the province of Quebec, where the provincial government refuses authority; they do not want to pay for the federal police any more. However it goes there, it stays there and it is paid to go there. But do not forget that we should endeavour to prevent the police from playing politics, and we have virtually evidence it does so. We have been fighting for two years. We have reached the point where we can no longer call a taxation office or another agency without getting the federal police on the phone. If you ask who is speaking, the answer is: "The federal police". What are they doing there? We should wonder about this. Nowadays it has become impossible, even for a member of parliament, to have a discussion with any of the leaders of this country without him being attended by a federal police-