

Plan without permission and “may have jeopardized the prospects of the applicants’ getting the jobs, Ontario Attorney-General McMurtry said Tuesday”. This is a clipping from the *Journal* of March 1. Here’s a case where some people may not have got jobs because of illegal actions of the security forces. Are we to treat that lightly? Suppose it is only one case in Canada a year. Are we to treat it as though it is unimportant? Supposing that 99 out of every 100 people in Canada think we are wrong not to give the government absolute power to open everything and to listen to everything and to take away all our privacy. Supposing 99 per cent think that. Would we be right to allow some people to lose jobs or not get jobs because of illegal actions of the government? Surely that is not a reasonable position to take, and it is not a position that I will take or can take.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is going to go to the committee, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and I have little hope that it is going to come out much better than it went in. I don’t think the government is likely to agree that there should be changes made in it, and if it comes out as it went in, as I say, I will be voting against it. I have to go on the record as being against it. I will be against it in any event, but I am doubly against it because of the sorry record of this government in security matters. It just does not inspire in me the confidence to give them any further authority.

The Solicitor General apparently is going to accept personal responsibility for warrants now under this legislation. I wonder how long it will be when a question is asked before he says no, no, he doesn’t take any responsibility; he just signs them blindly; that “they send them up to me from the security service and I blindfold myself, honourable gentlemen in the House of Commons, and I sign them, so I can’t take responsibility”. That will be the song we will hear in six months’ time when the bill goes through, or in a year’s time. He should report to the House with full details, if he gets this power, every year, and there should be a special national security committee of this House, in my opinion, with all parties represented, and all questions of security involving ministers and M.P.’s should certainly go to that committee where national security is involved. We should have a freedom of information act to show us that the government has got some sincerity and is not afraid to have any information at all go out on them.

● (1512)

So, Mr. Speaker, in winding up, here is the honourable drug-taker from Vancouver—the woman who is against drug-taking, I am sorry, from Vancouver. It is too bad she was overborne by her party. The party that is supporting the pot ignored the hon. member here a few weeks ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, what we want in dealing with this bill and in dealing with the government—

An hon. Member: They want a pot in every chicken.

Criminal Code

Mr. Crosbie: They want a pot in every chicken.

Mrs. Holt: What about the Conservative conventions?

Mr. Woolliams: We have never had a pot in our conventions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Lefebvre): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Lefebvre): In order for him to continue there must be unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Crosbie: I just wanted to end, Mr. Speaker, if that is agreed. I was at my last sentence. What we want then, Mr. Speaker, addressed to this bill is a sculping knife to get at the truth. We have got to use the truth-dealing gaff on this bill, the same one that the sealers are using. We have got to pelt the hide off the smug seals of Liberal self-satisfaction. We have got to puncture their pretensions. We have got to remove the blubber of Liberal blunders and really get into this bill, Mr. Speaker, and eviscerate it before I can vote for it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Lafontaine-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I shall speak later on about the remarks of the hon. member for St. John’s West (Mr. Crosbie) when I come to the problem of national security as dealt with in this bill, but I should like to limit myself, first of all, to remarks of a judicial nature, at the risk of sounding like a dotard to my colleague for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) about the concept of direct or indirect evidence, and the pertinence of that evidence before the courts.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is extremely interesting to note that Bill C-26 now before the House is the direct counterpart, with regards to communications, of another bill which dealt with oral communications, namely the Protection of Privacy Act and the regulations on the guarantees related to wiretapping. Mr. Speaker, I noticed with great interest when I first read the provisions of this bill that in clause 178, paragraph 2 in Bill C-26 the same concept was introduced that had been the object of an intervention on my part on March 3, 1978, on a motion for second reading of Bill C-227 by the hon. member for Calgary North, concept which can be defined thus: To mar the image of justice, concept which allows to guarantee, once and for all, the pertinence in a debate or judicial proceedings, of wiretapping, or in the case of Bill C-26, wiretapping itself, when the Crown, for some reason or other, decides to introduce as evidence, which it can do under the terms of section 178, paragraphs (1), (2) and (3), evidence provided directly or indirectly by wiretapping or illegal interception. I