

nedey and Lyndon B. Johnson administrations, the results of a law somewhat similar to the legislation now before us, and even harsher in some respects.

Many of those who spoke in favour of this bill said that they wanted to help the police. On this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote what Mr. Clark, who was in charge of security in the United States, told us. He said, and I quote:

[English]

I think it hurts the police in many ways: I think it makes them defensive; I think it makes the public more hostile and suspicious of them, and of their performance, and of what they are doing; I think it makes them justify things that do not need to be justified; it isolates them. I think it also corrupts.

[Translation]

To those who argue that we are going to help the police, I say, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will have just the opposite effect.

As for immorality, remember the first case brought before the Supreme Court of the United States, namely the Olmstead case . . .

[English]

—in which Oliver Wendell Holmes described wiretapping as a dirty business . . . It is far more than a dirty business: it tinkers with the foundations for individual integrity.

How else are the people going to know what is going on? Finally, what happens? Everybody thinks he is tapped and bugged. He really does.

[Translation]

And right here in parliament, Mr. Speaker, nothing in the law could prevent someone from phoning an hon. member and registering his conversation. I would like to quote from Mr. Ramsey Clark's testimony previously cited in parliament, in which he stated:

[English]

I come further because of my great concern about government lawlessness, the excessive use of force, violence, treachery and secrecy, and because I believe your fortunate country has a high opportunity and, with that, a high obligation to show the world that we can act fairly with safety.

[Translation]

Obviously, some may not be convinced of the immorality of wiretapping but, Mr. Speaker, I think, that in such a field human dignity and integrity require that we should refrain from resorting to such procedures, especially when the evidence shows that they are inefficient.

In the United States, in spite of stricter legislation than the bill introduced today, the scandals are of common knowledge and I do not refer to what is going on here, since the legislation was almost non-existent, but abuses at home as abroad are entirely unfortunate.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, that in recent months an aide of the president of the United States admitted that he used wiretapping to register a conversation with the attorney general of the United States. We know also that the advocate of non-violence, Martin Luther King, was also the victim of such procedure. We are also acquainted with several other scandals. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we come to the conclusion that this is a really degrading method.

When Mr. Ramsey Clark, as attorney general of the United States, prohibited the use of that procedure, the

Protection of Privacy

statistics have shown that the arrests and convictions of criminals, especially in organized crime, had tripled during those years. And I could quote some examples.

● (2100)

[English]

When you look at the report in the administrative office of the United States courts for 1972 you will find places like California where no wiretaps were applied for. It is a pretty big place.

It has almost the same population as Canada.

There is a lot of activity out there. There is pretty effective crime control and crime fighting. It is every bit as effective, or more so, than New York city. You find Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania—whole places that have had a lot of organized crime but no wiretapping. And they can be effective. You find almost two-thirds of all the wiretapping in two states, New York and New Jersey. It is a matter of habit, and it is a very unfortunate habit. I do not think you will find more effective organized criminal activity than in the New York city area.

Where wiretapping is very common.

[Translation]

I said earlier that during all the years he was in charge of security, the attorney general of the United States had not allowed the use of those methods, and the number of charges increased. He mentioned cases where a staff of more than 30 policemen was needed to tap a single person. He explained how several American cities, by making the same human efforts in professionalizing their police force, had obtained far quicker results and at a much lower cost.

So much for the immorality and inefficiency of that practice. I could also mention the numerous scandals that arose. For example, in the Ellsberg case in the United States, it took two years before someone admitted in court that the accused had been submitted to wiretapping. That, among other things made the state lose its case.

And as Mr. Ramsay Clark said:

[English]

You will find, I think, as we have, that wiretapping is always associated with scandals.

[Translation]

And he shared his experience with us. He stated that in his opinion much better results had been obtained with these police forces on which both money and efforts had been spent to give their members a professional training and this, without jeopardizing in any way the individuals' dignity and integrity.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons why I am against wiretapping. I feel that the amendment introduced by the opposition is a step in the right direction, because the bill in its present form appears to me to be much too wide in scope in respect of crimes known as indictable offences which may entail electronic wiretapping; on the other hand, I am absolutely against any bugging in all other areas, especially as regards domestic matters.

That is the way I see it, Mr. Speaker. I feel that, taking into account the experience of the United States where a law such as this existed, scandals multiplied. And when I think of the United States where, according to the evidence we have heard, only the attorney general of the United States: