

the alleged reports indicating that some 58 copies of a security document were disseminated among government services. In a nation of 55 million people, only two officials see the information.

Also I draw the Solicitor General's attention to the diversity of the statistics between a nation that size and one the size of the United States with respect to the number of interceptions as reported by his predecessors in the two previous reports tabled under the Official Secrets Act and the Protection of Privacy Act. The committee in England was satisfied that it was a useful tool for protecting national security. In general principle we agree with that. Also we agree that it is a very useful investigative tool in order to assist law enforcement officers of this country in performing their duties. An hon. member opposite cited the example of a gram of heroin being worth \$5 at source and being finally transmitted in this country at a value of approximately \$16,000. If the passage of this bill can eliminate that kind of thing, then there cannot possibly be any reasonable resistance to placing that tool in the hands of Canadian law enforcement officers. We feel it will at least curtail that type of thing.

My personal recommendation, which is not made on behalf of my party, is that a review process should be set up along the lines of the recommendations that the privy councillors included in their report. That report indicates there should be a regular review of outstanding warrants, not less than once a month, by the office of the solicitor general and by every authority that is granted a warrant to intercept. That is an essential follow up as a safeguard against abuse.

The committee also recommended that warrants should no longer be valid until they are cancelled, but their validity should be for a defined period that appears on their face. I think this bill covers that, but the period is far too long. They recommended that the cancellation of a warrant by the authority to whom it was issued should be forthwith reported to the home office. In other words, that will be reported to the office of the Solicitor General in Canada. Also it recommended that in future each warrant issued by the secretary of state, which in this case would be the Solicitor General, should specify the particulars set out by the committee of privy councillors.

Another recommendation was that full records showing the details set out by the committee of privy councillors should be kept in the home office in the case of each interception. The reports now filed by the Solicitor General with respect to criminal matters should include far more information than is included now. I understand it may well be against the interests of national security even to publish the numbers which the committee report concluded. Perhaps even the numbers mentioned by the Solicitor General, with respect to security matters in his report under the Protection of Privacy Act or under this bill, should not be mentioned. There is a valid argument for that, but only if the annual monthly reporting goes to him as part of his ministerial responsibility to review the particulars of these warrants issued in respect of national security matters.

Criminal Code

● (2032)

A further recommendation is, as I have just stated, that:

It would be against the public interest for the Secretary of State to give figures of the extent of the interception in communications, for the reasons set out.

That has reference to national security cases.

In respect of a member of parliament, the committee concluded that he is in exactly the same position as any private citizen in regard to the interception of his communications unless those communications were held to be connected with a proceeding in parliament. That is a very important phrase, and the subject matter of the question of privilege I raised some time ago, of which the Special Committee on Rights and Immunities of Members is now seized.

I should like to be able to inform members of parliament of my familiarity with this subject. I have discussed the matter with the Solicitor General in an off-hand way and he is aware that my background is such that I am bound by the Official Secrets Act in respect of any such disclosure. In any event, even if I took advantage of the immunities offered by parliament it would be against my better judgment to familiarize members with my knowledge of those matters. However, the Solicitor General knows whereof I speak. He knows what is going on in this country, and he knows also of the need for giving very serious consideration to the suggestions I have made here and which apparently have found favour in the mother of parliaments.

The interception of communications of a private citizen, whether by opening his mail, by intercepting a telephone communication or by electronic surveillance, which is very highly sophisticated these days, is a deep intrusion into the civil liberties and the private affairs of any citizen. The safeguards absent from the bill in respect of a review of that process. All that is required of the minister is to produce a raft of numerical statistics, but that is not good enough. In my submission, the review should go at least to the extent it goes in England and in the United States. They go even further in the United States.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: I have just two sentences, Mr. Speaker. They go even further in the United States. They have provided that these matters be referred on a regular basis to what in effect would amount to our Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Perhaps that is not necessary and the suggestion of the hon. member for Peace River is more in accord with what our practice should be. However, that kind of practice should be set up, to be held in camera if necessary, so as not to jeopardize the interests of national security.

The other matter is this. At least in England they have gone to the extent of requiring a review beyond a mere statistical