

Unfortunately, he is now responsible for another portfolio to do with monetary and fiscal affairs. He left his previous portfolio in which his strain of Irish goodness was able to show itself from time to time, and assumed responsibility for the portfolio in which a parsimonious attitude on behalf of the government must be exhibited. If he still occupied that portfolio, I suggest he would show a grasp of this problem much greater than his grasp of the problems to do with his present portfolio which have to do with economic, monetary and fiscal matters. I think the country suffered a bit because he left justice. It has certainly suffered because he went into finance.

● (2150)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: None the less, he is my neighbour. Sometimes there is very little in my heart with which I can praise, but on that occasion in 1969 there was a great deal. I should reiterate this in the most neighbourly fashion I can muster.

As we consider this bill we should consider that it is a giant step forward in providing the police and public agencies for the first time with the right to legally and usefully use a system of detection which the law never before permitted. That in itself imposes a great responsibility on them. In order to control that responsibility, parliament has decided the judiciary has a place. That was a wise decision. When historians look back at this parliament they will agree that if we were going to give that power it was a wise move indeed to provide that kind of protection, a protection which I must say, to my regret, the Minister of Justice fought against until he was dragged away kicking and screaming. The courts indeed have a part to play in this new form of police power.

None of us wants to see the public authorities hampered in any way. We do not want to see the Attorney General hampered in any way with respect to the functions of his office. We do not want to see the police of this country put in any worse position technologically than the lowest criminal or, indeed, the highest of the order of criminals, if there is such an order. Every one of us wants to see the police armed to protect society against the works of those who would seek to bring it down.

At the same time as we are giving the police this power we are giving a responsibility to the courts to protect society. We are giving the law officers a certain power, in this clause, in extraordinary circumstances when the country is actually facing the possibility of destruction in terms of its political interests, with its enormous power which this parliament has seen fit to convey and confer upon the Solicitor General, the Attorney General and others involved in the decision-making process. With that power there is a heavy responsibility not to use it in a political way to destroy or divert those who are perhaps the enemies of the government of the day, but to use it properly, wisely, judiciously and honestly to track down only those who would destroy the government of our country rather than those who would merely question it.

I am prepared to recognize that under certain circumstances there is a difference between the common criminal and those who would destroy the state. I do that on the

Adjournment Debate

understanding that whatever power is given to any government of this country is not a licence to misuse that power for its own sake. When I heard the hon. member for Louis-Hébert the other day, my blood ran cold. If I had the honour of defending the Minister of Finance I would not even recommend her for his jury because I feel so badly about her speech. I read and reread that speech.

Mrs. Morin: Oh, it impressed you, did it?

Mr. Baker: I wonder how one of such a gentle exterior can have dripping in her veins the ice that was apparent and will leak forever from the pages of *Hansard*.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired. If the House wishes, I will put the question on the motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is not agreed. It has been called ten o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe this is the last of the report stage amendments. I wonder whether we could extend the time three or four minutes and complete this part of the work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is correct that this is the last of the motions to be considered at the report stage. The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear "No."

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there are other members of our party who have indicated a desire to speak.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order No. 40 deemed to have been moved.

CANADIAN ECONOMY—INCREASE IN COST OF FOOD— POSSIBLE PROGRAMS TO SUPPLY FOOD TO THOSE ON LOW INCOMES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, nutritional experts are taking a cautious view of the first findings of the Nutrition Canada survey. As one critic observed, it raises more questions than it provides answers and health experts do not know what to make of