and passed down the distribution chain, the resulting portions sell for $16,000 on the streets . . .

The use of the mail is an insidious means of importing with little risk of detection.

That was only the relevant part, but I notice that the Solicitor General was more modest in estimating the street value of such a gram of heroin. He placed it at $11,400. I am prepared to accept his figures on that. The point is that the value increases enormously with distribution and, of course, with the addition of other substances which increase the quantity. This is therefore a serious problem that we have to confront.

Earlier in the year the Commissioner of the RCMP presented the problem to the justice committee, and the members of the committee realized that something had to be done to prevent this from happening. This was not an area in which we could wait the requisite length of time until the McDonald commission had reported. One of the important aspects of this bill is that this is sunset legislation. The bill will end within a limited time after the presentation of the report of the McDonald commission.

Some hon. members opposite have raised the question, "What if the McDonald commission does not make a final report?" Can anyone in this House seriously imagine a commission on a matter of such vital importance to the country not making a final report? If for some reason it did not, surely another commission would be appointed that would make a final report. It is inconceivable that there would be no final report of that commission. The length of the life of this legislation is tied to that report.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I sense a disposition even on the part of the opposition, of opponents to the bill, not to raise serious questions about mail opening with respect to narcotics, but rather to attempt to attack the opening of mail for purposes of national security. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) made the sharpest attack on the possible meaning of this section. He said as reported at page 3775 of *Hansard*:

This legislation gives to the Solicitor General an unbridled discretion to issue a warrant in determining which group he considers to be subversive, and any group can be subversive if they are suspected of using any criminal means.

Let me give the Solicitor General some examples of groups which could now become subject to the opening of mail at the hon. gentleman's discretion—and I am sure he will use that discretion in the broadest way he can, to judge by his record to date. Take, for example, one group which appears to be unpopular at the moment, the Greenpeace organization. The government recently made it an offence for anyone to go on the ice within half a mile of the seal herd. To do so carries a penalty under the criminal law. It would probably be a popular thing for the minister in present circumstances to issue warrants permitting all the mail of Greenpeace to be opened. That is just one example. I could mention many other groups, native groups, anti-poverty groups and so on.

While obviously, Mr. Speaker, a member who is attacking a bill is free to try to extend the legislation to make it look at its worst, I think that this is a poor interpretation to give to the bill. It is an impossible interpretation, and I think it arouses needless anxiety where there should be none. Section 16(2) of the Official Secrets Act, which was added to the act at the time we amended the protection of privacy legislation with respect to wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping, reads as follows:

(2) The Solicitor General of Canada may issue a warrant authorizing the interception or seizure of any communication if he is satisfied by evidence on oath that such interception or seizure is necessary for the prevention or detection of subversive activity directed against Canada—

● (1422)

That is the relative part of that subsection because it goes on to say:

—or detrimental to the security of Canada or is necessary for the purpose of gathering foreign intelligence information essential to the security of Canada.

The words that the hon. member for New Westminster has put in question are those relating to "the prevention or detection of subversive activity directed against Canada." Those words are defined in 16.(3) which defines subversive activity under a number of possibilities. Three of those are directed toward activities of foreign countries: foreign intelligence activities are dealt with in subparagraph (b), activities by a foreign power in subparagraph (d), and activities of a foreign terrorist group in subparagraph (e). Those are not particularly relevant to the present discussion since the hon. member for New Westminster did not bring them into contention. Subparagraph (a) deals, simply with espionage or sabotage. It cannot really be supposed that there is any problem about that.

The subparagraph about which the hon. member has argued there can be some question is subparagraph (c) which reads as follows:

(c) activities directed toward accomplishing governmental change within Canada or elsewhere by force or violence or any criminal means;

That is where the hon. member for New Westminster found the phrase "or any criminal means." He has ignored a very important part of that subsection, however,—"activities directed toward accomplishing governmental change." Surely no one is going to argue, whatever his views on the seal hunt, that taking a stand one way or the other is a means of accomplishing governmental change in Canada. By overlooking that important part of the definition of subversive activity, it seems to me that the hon. member for New Westminster has given an entirely impossible interpretation to this legislation in suggesting that it could be applied to groups such as Greenpeace. I think this is somewhat mischievous. It could arouse a real apprehension on the part of such groups that they might be subject to scrutiny of this kind when there really is no possibility under the legislation that that could occur.

I should add that the Solicitor General would in any event have to find that in his best judgment and based on evidence under oath there were activities directed toward accomplishing governmental change by force or violence, or any criminal means. There is a fairly heavy onus to be satisfied by those who appear before him seeking such a warrant.

Indeed, it seems to me that the only valid question to raise about the power to open mail for the protection of national security is with respect to the organ of government which should give permission. I do not really see, and I do not think