

*Criminal Code*

harm. This is law capable of causing harm as severe as any of the dangers it might conceivably seek to prevent.

I agree with that 100 per cent. That is just what this is. I do not trust this government. They do not need to have this legislation passed. They have already demonstrated that they are eager and willing to engage in illegal activities whenever they want. They do not need this legislation and they are not going to get my approval unless there are a lot more safeguards put into this bill. Not on your life! It has not been demonstrated that it is necessary. We know the government can already deal with bombs going through the mail and so on. They have that authority in other areas.

The record of the government is shameful. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made a sad mistake. I made a mistake of giving him a vote for the leadership of the Liberal party. I should be scolded for ever having done it. I was a delegate at that time. Thank God I saw the light. At that time he was a civil libertarian.

**Mr. Daudlin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. I do not want to take any of his time. My point of order does not relate to the substance of what the hon. member is saying but rather to the electronic *Hansard* we now have in the House, namely, the television cameras.

● (1452)

Just a moment ago in the lobby of the House, while watching the hon. member on television, I noticed that instead of showing the hon. member in the midst of his speech the camera was zeroing in on the notes the hon. member was using. I suggest that when the electronic medium was brought into the House its purpose was to provide an electronic *Hansard* which would record visually and in sound what was going on in the chamber. But zeroing in on a speaker's notes is not the function of an electronic *Hansard* and in my view, directions should be given from the Chair that the practice should cease.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** The hon. member might have a point of order or even a question of privilege. I will take it under advisement and make a judgment at a later date.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Well, my notes are in order, I hope.

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

**Mr. Crosbie:** So if they zero in on my notes it should be all right.

Well, the Prime Minister was a great civil libertarian in his day. Was. He is now the new Duplessis of Canada. That's what he is today. And when we are considering whether this bill should be passed or not, Mr. Speaker, we should consider the mood and thoughts and how the government acts. Let's look at the Prime Minister today, 15 years after *Cité Libre* and all that business, fifteen years after fighting Mr. Duplessis he is the new Duplessis of Canada.

**An hon. Member:** Oh!

[Mr. Crosbie.]

**Mr. Crosbie:** Just listen a moment and I will convince you. You'll be right over here with us in a few minutes. I have here the transcript of the Prime Minister's press conference of October 28, 1977. He was asked a question—I am referring to page six of the transcript. Just a moment. I will get to that one in a minute. I want now to refer to page four. The Prime Minister said, "I think in circumstances like that if the law has to be broken technically in order to save a city then either it should be broken technically or the law should be changed to make that not an illegal act. And that is what McDonald is going to advise us on."

Well, the Prime Minister was asked about breaking into a building by certain people who worked for the RCMP security services. He was asked whether this illegal act should be tolerated. He went on to say how policemen broke the law sometimes and drove fast to catch a man who was escaping from a bank. Then he went on with this irrelevancy that if the law had to be broken technically to save a city then he thought that either it should be broken or that the law should be changed. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of codswallop a hypocrite uses, that a person who doesn't care about the truth uses, that a person that doesn't care about civil liberties uses.

What does it have to do with breaking the law technically to save a city if somebody breaks and enters an office to take membership lists, or if somebody burns down a barn, or if somebody gives information wrongfully to National Revenue or the RCMP if they are not supposed to, or if the law forbids it, or if somebody intercepts and opens mail when it is illegal to do so? What has that got to do with saving a city? That is not saving anything. That is the specious argument of an authoritarian. That is the argument of a padlock law supporter. So never let it be put to us again that the Prime Minister is a civil libertarian. He is not. He has left that long behind him. He is a man who is now anxious to cling to power by any means at all.

**An hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Crosbie:** Has there been anybody prosecuted for all these illegal acts yet? Not on your life!

**Mr. Woolliams:** They have been given medals.

**Mr. Crosbie:** The great civil libertarian. Those people are getting medals! Now, on another question. The Prime Minister said the government and the Solicitor General and those who were involved should not really know much about security matters. They should not interfere with what the police were doing in the security service and with the RCMP. At the same press conference he said, and I quote from page six:

And if the government, the ministers or myself had begun asking the RCMP in any detail about their operations and where did you get this fact on the file and who gave you this information and what do you say on so and so in your file and how do you know—we would certainly have been accused by the opposition and probably by people like yourself, Mr. Wilson, of having undue political influence and interference in the RCMP.

So he is suggesting that the less we know the better. It is like the story of three monkeys, one had his hands over his eyes, the other had his hands over his ears, and the third had his