

[Translation]

Then, on page 33, Senator Huddleston asked Mr. Osborn, one of the directors general, the following question, quote:

[English]

Do you know of any instances that were cited where it had been helpful to them in carrying out their responsibility?

[Translation]

And Mr. Osborn replied, on page 33:

[English]

Not specific instances, Senator, no.

[Translation]

On page 168, Senator Schwartz asked the following question, I quote:

[English]

Over the course of the 15 years that you received information from the CIA program, the record shows you received some 50,000 copies of letters. Did it lead to the identification of a single illegal agent?

Mr. Branigan, the chief inspector of the CIA, said:

To my knowledge, no.

[Translation]

And to give you an idea of the extent of this program in the United States, I should like to quote from one of Senator Church's statements. I am referring to page 131:

[English]

Beginning in 1953 and ending finally in 1973, the figures show that there was a total volume of letters coming through the New York Post Office that was subject to culling and opening and photographing by the CIA, in this particular program, a total of 28,322,796. Of that number, based as we have heard now on certain watch lists that were established, but in the main, on random selection accounting for two thirds of the inspections, there was a total of 2,705,726 envelopes that were photographed plus 389,324 envelopes that were copied. And the number of those letters that were illegally opened and whose contents were photographed came to 215,820,—

[Translation]

And then he quoted a series of figures.

[English]

I think those figures speak for themselves, that it was a program that not only extended for a great number of years but was also very sizeable.

[Translation]

So, Mr. Speaker, besides it is significant that, as far as Canada is concerned, the only case relating to security that has been mentioned is still the one concerning that Japanese terrorist. In the past several months, we have not heard of any other case. Furthermore, according to the testimony given to the McDonald commission, I think that the opening of that letter was not absolutely essential to the arrest of that terrorist. I might be asked why do I take such an interest in civil liberties, in the liberties enjoyed by each of us, but I do think that basically this is the main concern of all the members in this House.

### *Criminal Code*

I will quote a passage from a book published by the government a few year ago, on the type of constitution we would like Canadians to enjoy and which says, and I quote:

The first and foremost objective of the Canadian Federation, according to the government of Canada, is to protect the rights of the individuals. That means first guaranteeing the individual rights of all Canadians. That is a fundamental element of the state: take away those rights and few Canadians will think their country is worth preserving.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that question to be fundamental and that we do not have the right to say: If the McDonald commission suggests that that power is not necessary, then we will drop the law. I think this is a very ill advised way of doing things.

And in the same vein I must say that it has become obvious that the Keable commission in Quebec that was supposed to look into that question of the protection of individual rights and police compliance with the law, Mr. Speaker, was intended to be used mainly to foster another federal-provincial quarrel. When we consider that 95 per cent of the hearings of that commission dealt with the activities of the federal police and barely 5 per cent with those of police departments coming under the jurisdiction of the Quebec government and when we see how the commissioner was appointed, a young lawyer of 30 who was a member of the party in power. Let us compare with the appointment by the previous government in Quebec of the Cliche commission where a permanent judge was selected to preside over a commission with two other commissioners who were opposed to the government. Now as far as the federal government is concerned, an experienced, independent and permanent judge was selected, a judge who was not afraid to put adds in the newspapers asking the people of this country to inform him of illegalities they could be aware of relating to the federal police. Nothing like that was done with the Keable commission.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that when we are dealing with matters of basic rights such as the one which is now before the House and we do not have the right to use it to foster federal-provincial quarrels. Fundamental rights are essentially rights that no government can touch. And I would like to conclude by quoting the following comment by Ramsey Clark, the former attorney general of the United States:

● (2052)

[English]

Privacy is the basis of individuality. To be alone and be let alone, to be with chosen company, to say what you think, or don't think, but to say what you will, is to be yourself. Solitude is imperative, even in a high rise apartment. Personality develops from within. To reflect is to know yourself. Character is formed through years of self examination. Without this opportunity, character will be formed largely by uncontrolled external social stimulations... Few conversations would be what they are if the speakers thought others were listening. Silly, secret, thoughtless and thoughtful statements would all be affected.

[Translation]

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we would be very ill-advised to put a stop to any new infringement upon that fundamental right