

*Protection of Privacy*

**Mrs. Morin:** Nobody can deny that the crime rate is constantly increasing. Criminals are becoming more and more specialized, and yet the methods used for fighting this increase in crime are constantly being eroded. Quebec has not hesitated to prove that it wants law and order. For instance, the October 29 election was a vote against separatism, but it was also a vote for law and order. René Lévesque himself admitted that a week or so ago when he stated publicly that the population still associated his party with the FLQ. It is true that the Parti Québécois is a political party and the FLQ is a subversive group, but the people who see such persons as Chartrand, Lemieux and Charbonneau within the Parti Québécois cannot be blamed for thinking as they do.

Another proof that Quebecers want law and order was demonstrated during the common front crisis in 1972 when three labour union leaders were incarcerated. First of all, they defied the government. The population cheered when the union leaders were incarcerated. And again, after the last election—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mrs. Morin:** Laugh all you want.

**Mr. Atkey:** No, I cry.

**Mrs. Morin:** Again, after the last election, when the same union leaders asked the population to bring down the Bourassa government, how did the population react? By an overwhelming majority, a sweep of 102 seats for the Liberals. So the NDP must not forget that the unions in our province have been a source of unrest, disorder and trouble. The NDP and the Conservative party should keep this in mind when this bill comes up for the vote.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I have not taken part in this debate until now for two reasons: First of all, because I was not a member of the committee which studied the provisions of the bill in detail, and second because I admit that like many members I am perturbed about the decisions which we as members of parliament are being asked to make. On the one hand, I am absolutely opposed to the invasion of privacy of any person in Canada by private individuals or by representatives of the government for any reason. On the other hand, I recognize the difficulties which exist in this country.

I cannot ignore the fact that in a recent case in Toronto some people who were very deeply involved in trafficking heroin—a very dangerous drug—were convicted and sentenced to life to a large extent on the basis of evidence obtained by wiretapping. So I find it difficult to join my colleague, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), in supporting laws which would totally prohibit wiretapping. I want to say to the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) that the doubts which I have about voting against any kind of wiretapping are removed to a large extent when I hear the kind of impassioned bigotry which she exhibited in her speech during the last few moments.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Orlikow:** The position of our party on the question of federalism is clear to every person in Canada. We oppose separatism, we oppose violence under any circumstances. We oppose separatism even when it is put forward by people who may agree with us on certain other matters. I have no use politically or personally for a person like Michel Chartrand, but he has a right to express his point of view as much as I, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert or the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner), as long as it is done in a legal way. I want to tell the hon. member for Louis-Hébert that it will be a sad day for this country when, because she or I or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) disagree with Mr. Chartrand, Mr. LaLiberté or Mr. Lévesque, somebody can begin to listen in to their private conversations.

I want to say to the hon. member for Louis-Hébert that the police are not always right. A few weeks ago I finished reading a couple of books dealing with certain incidents in Canadian history. They deal with the general strike which took place in Winnipeg in 1919, and in the course of dealing with that strike one of the books relates what the role of the police was. It was not a very good role for the simple reason that the police believed, as is obvious to anybody who looks at the history of the time and of the strike, that that was an attempt to create a revolution. The police were wrong and they did things which they should not have done. I also read a book which recounted the events surrounding the trek of the unemployed, which began in Vancouver, to Ottawa to make representations to the then Conservative government headed by R. B. Bennett. That book recounts the activities of the police and the RCMP. Again, things were done which should not have been done because the police and the government of the day believed that it was the beginning of a Communist revolution in Canada, which it was not.

Let us look at the province of Quebec. A few years ago there was a strike of the copper workers at Murdochville and the then provincial government of Quebec headed by Mr. Duplessis, who was also the attorney general, used the Quebec police to break that strike. The labour leaders, not just the Quebec labour leaders but the then president of the Canadian Labour Congress, participated in a protest march against the handling of that strike. Let me tell the hon. member for Louis-Hébert—and I wish she would listen for a few moments—that one of the people who participated in that march protesting the actions of the police was a professor at the University of Montreal law school whose name happened to be Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Mr. Trudeau was not saying at that time in the 1960's that because the government of Quebec had said that the strike at Murdochville was illegal, because the police of Quebec were taking violent action to break that strike—

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** The Asbestos strike.

**Mr. Orlikow:** That is a separate matter and I do not have the time to tell the hon. member for Louis-Hébert about the Asbestos strike and how the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) was involved in it.

**Mrs. Morin:** That was 25 years ago.

**Mr. Orlikow:** That interjection by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert indicates her views on this kind of matter,