

set in motion, then there should be at once an immediate and emphatic denial by the government. That denial has not been forthcoming and in my view it should, otherwise no one in the Ottawa area can rest easy that his telephone is not being kept under surveillance.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the debate. I am particularly interested in the amendment and the subamendment, specifically in the amendment that was put forward in the committee and the decision that was made on that amendment. I was also interested in particular to watch the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) when the member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) asked him whether he would not apply the normal criteria for admissible evidence.

I think the hon. member for Yukon used the analytic reports and the chemical analysis reports, one affecting drunken driving and the other affecting forensic medicine laboratory tests. The minister shook his head. I presume he has a new set of regulations that he will bring out to establish whether or not there is legality or illegality. I was surprised to hear the remarks he made on the amendment when he pointed out that if, for instance, it was a case of murder and by legal or illegal eavesdropping in the course of some other operation evidence was obtained without any justification under the law, it would be accepted. I gather from my reading of his interpretation of what is legal that he probably put security police in private agencies such as Pinkerton's in the same category.

I listened with interest also to the speech of the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin), which I think demonstrated the thinking of the Liberal Party with regard to law and order. There is a total and unique phobia in the province of Quebec, which results probably from their civil law and which was probably created by the Liberal Party that the police cannot be wrong, that everyone is guilty until proven innocent and that whatever the police may do, they are right. The thinking of the people in the province of Quebec in that respect is disastrous. They disregard their individual rights and freedoms and I am shocked by the way they are willing to give them up. Thank God the Anglo-Saxons in this country do not have the same qualms about standing up for their individual rights.

It was mentioned the other day, in an exposé which turned out very well for justice, that 137 policemen in their three ton trucks, with tarpaulin on top, arrived at the basement of a hotel. They included provincial and town cops—every cop they could pick up in the area—and they swore in the deputies as well. The indication is that they had made a number of arrests, supposedly on marijuana charges. Three of the ten people who were arrested there and who were found in the pub were charged with drinking under age, which of course leaves seven who perhaps were smoking pot and perhaps were not.

So there were seven innocent people sitting in the beer parlour, and 137 policemen raided the place. Good God, there must be something wrong with society and something wrong with intelligence and the sense of justice in this country. Does the judge give out so many warrants that policemen can raid a place on marijuana charges in that way? No wonder the minister thinks it is all right to

### *Protection of Privacy*

obtain illegal evidence. He would be agreeable to anything.

I suggest that if after the next election the university board of directors considered the minister for the position of dean of the university from which he came, and listened to any of the remarks made by his peers, it is doubtful that he would even be considered for the position of janitor in that institution.

**An hon. Member:** What about a county court judge?

**Mr. Peters:** I suppose that politicians can always be appointed county court judges. There are probably 10,000 of them in Canada, and this is one of the problems. You can get a warrant for anything, from anybody, at any time. I suppose that even security branches that are not directly connected with the government can obtain warrants, if they wish, from some judges.

An interesting thing happened in Ottawa last Friday night, fairly close to home. It concerns what the police do, how they do it and whether or not they bother with the legality of wiretapping or whether they try to find, as the minister says, some evidence from their investigation that will warrant the use of wiretapping for which there is no legal justification. As you know, Mr. Speaker, a large percentage of the protective staff in this building are veterans. Most of them served overseas. If you look around this building you will see all of the protective staff wearing ribbons that set them apart from most Canadians.

● (1650)

Last week a member of the protective staff received a phone call from his wife. She was hysterical. A Mounted Policeman had walked into her bathroom while she was taking a bath, walked over to her, did not show her a warrant—warrants are not of too much importance to the Mounted Police—only showed her his badge and told her to get out of the tub. She told him to get the hell out of there, that she didn't have to get out of the tub. He ordered her out again, and then the RCMP searched through the apartment and dumped all the medicine pills out on the floor. She had a little bottle of black beans that she was going to plant, and they dumped them on the floor. They took the buttons out of the button bag. I went to the place later and looked through the apartment, Mr. Speaker. They had dumped all kinds of stuff into cooking utensils. They had cleaned out the refrigerator and shifted everything from its proper place.

When this lady protested to the officer, he kept insulting her and telling her to mind her own business. He asked her, "Where does your husband work?" She told him her husband was on the protective staff of the House of Commons. He then said he hadn't asked her what her husband did, only where he worked. I made inquiries from the narcotics squad and found out that that night there was a big raid going in Ottawa. I suppose that, like the traffic cops, they have to appear to be doing something. I should mention that the building containing the apartment is owned by Mr. Assaly, a very influential man in Ottawa. I am not aware whether or not Mr. Assaly runs the hashish operation in Ottawa, or whether the RCMP think Mr. Assaly runs the hashish operation, but they did have a warrant for one apartment in the building.