

### Protection of Privacy

and, in the course of rivalry, one member of the opposite groups was violently beaten and injured. It was decided to gain revenge that they should kill the chief of the other group. They put a bomb in a car a few feet from the school. The bomb was supposed to explode at 8.30 a.m., at a time when we were told there would be more than 1,000 school children. Because of the wiretapping, we were able—

The police were able.

—to discover this project, to stop the individual and prevent not only the murder of the chief of the opposite group but also the killing of innocent children.

I shall relate another case which was told to me very recently. In Quebec City a woman bank manager was advised by the police that because of wiretapping they were aware that there would be a bank holdup in her bank. As a result they were able to deal with this attempted robbery of the bank and arrest the bank robbers. Again, through wiretapping they were able to prevent a bank robbery. The hon. member for Prince Albert is up in arms because the proposed bill jeopardizes the individual's right to privacy. I wonder whether the fact that school children's lives were saved because of wiretapping is not sufficient proof that public good should supersede the right of citizens. Mr. Justice Tremblay last week rendered a decision along this line when he said:

[Translation]

It is the public and general interest of the people of Quebec which is opposed to the interest of 2,000 of its inhabitants.

[English]

Should we not conclude from this very famous decision that where public safety and public good demands it, the right of the individual should be put aside, that is, that the police should have the right to wiretap when public safety demands it.

Again I refer to the minutes of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs at page 14:22 where the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe is reported as having said:

... we worry and we say that this might go too far ...

Then, he said that he feels the examples are very numerous which lead to the conclusion that it would be impossible to protect society adequately against professional criminals if the activities of the police were restricted.

Again I ask the hon. member for Prince Albert how he can qualify this bill as being the essence of tyranny when the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe says that we cannot protect society against professional criminals if we restrict the activities of the police. Police should be able to wiretap at all times and without any permit when the public good and public safety demand it. I doubt that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe thought any differently when he held the position of Attorney General of Quebec. We in the province of Quebec long for law and order. As I said, the reason the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe once upon a time was very popular is that he was for law and order.

We have seen a lot of unrest and disorder in our province, particularly during such riots as the student's march upon Parliament Hill to protest Bill 63, a march which was infiltrated by such radicals as Lemieux, Bourgault, Chartrand, Laliberté and Charbonneau, and again the St. John the Baptiste uprising in Montreal when police cars were overturned and set afire, when private property was ransacked and looted, when horses had their sides slashed

[Mrs. Morin.]

because they were mounted by policemen and when rocks and Molotov cocktails were thrown at our Prime Minister while the Quebec leader and the Montreal mayor ran for shelter. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe sided with the police during this critical period and even condemned the acts of the Quebec government which sabotaged the police work. But the hon. member had no doubt at that time that the citizen's right had to be put aside for the public good.

It is impossible to protect a society against professional criminals if we restrict police activities, said the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe. He said that if we were to restrict police activities it would be like removing the tools from the police; it would be like cutting off their arms and asking them to dig their own graves. This is the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe speaking. It appears now that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe has changed his mind about wiretapping. It is not the first time he has flip-flopped. You know, the population of Saint-Hyacinthe may also change its mind in the next election.

**An hon. Member:** They will give him a bigger majority.

**Mrs. Morin:** I would be in favour of letting the police wiretap whenever necessary. Of course, Bill C-176 does not go that far unfortunately. It includes very stiff penalties for those who disobey the law. For instance, section 178.11 states that anyone who wilfully intercepts a private communication by means of an electromagnetic, acoustic or mechanical device, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for five years. This is quite a stiff penalty for the offence of listening to one's conversation compared to the penalty for armed robbery.

Section 178.18 states that anyone selling or purchasing any electromagnetic, acoustic or mechanical device for the interception of private communications is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for two years. Compare that to other offences in respect of a person selling stolen goods. Section 178.20 states that anyone who uses or discloses such private communication in a way other than as stipulated by the bill is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for two years. Finally, section 178.21 stipulates punitive damages up to \$5,000. This is a very stiff penalty. So there are restrictions or stipulations limiting or preventing excesses in wiretapping activity.

Many of the amendments introduced by hon. members across the Chamber would be more beneficial to the criminals than to society. What they do not seem to realize is that even if this bill tries to impose a certain control on electronic devices, it does not necessarily mean the use of such devices by criminals would be controlled. They would only find more astute ways to avoid the law. So, the two parties across the Chamber should not be surprised if they do not find any support in the province of Quebec. They do not stand for law and order. No one will deny that the crime rate is constantly increasing.

● (1530)

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