

draw the line when we help the police? It would help the police, I suppose, if you gave every policeman a *lettre de cachet* so that he could imprison anyone for any reason at all and keep them there for the rest of their lives. If the minister thinks that that is far fetched, let me refer him to an incident which happened well within his lifetime.

The minister says to us that we should trust the Attorneys General. Why should we? What mystical quality have Attorneys General that we should repose our confidence in them? Ten years ago or a little better an Attorney General in the legislature of Ontario seriously presented to that house a bill that would have allowed the police commission to imprison people for the rest of their natural lives if they refused to give evidence, without habeas corpus, without the right to counsel, without even the right to a phone call to their families.

**An hon. Member:** That was a Tory government.

**Mr. Reilly:** I do not care who it was, it was a wrong bill. This was an Attorney General and he had to resign. Of course, this "hat holder" here, as the leader of the Creditiste party calls me, had the honour of being able to expose that bill for the rampant invasion of civil liberties that it was. The bill was withdrawn and the Attorney General subsequently resigned, and frankly I am very proud to have had a part to play in that. But there is an Attorney General for you.

It was an Attorney General in the province of Newfoundland who, not too many years ago, wanted to bring in the RCMP as strikebreakers. It was an Attorney General and premier of the province of Quebec, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) told us, who brought in the infamous padlock law. Lastly, it was a minister of justice of that government, and a former minister of justice, now Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who suspended the civil liberties of every person in this country three years ago, a very unhappy period in our history. Hundreds of people were thrust into prison in Montreal without right to civil liberty, without the right to call a lawyer, without habeas corpus. They had no rights at all. No charges were laid, no charges were withdrawn. People were released from jail under a cloud, and there is no telling how many careers have been damaged or wrecked because of that careless act. So, we have no cause to trust Attorneys General, and I do not think we have any cause to give untrammelled license to police forces either.

Let me give the Minister of Justice another example of a case in which the RCMP almost ruined a man's career, doubtless with the aid of wiretapping. This was at a time when I was with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and was the volunteer and unpaid president of one of those "vile, disgusting international trade unions" that so offend the hon. member for Louis-Hébert and her spiritual colleague in the Creditiste party. One of my associates in the city of Montreal applied for a job to which he was entitled under the terms of the collective agreement but which the corporation refused to give him. Upon examination I was told in secret by a senior official of the CBC that the reason he was not going to get the job was that the RCMP had informed the CBC that he was a security risk. Moreover, if I even told him the real reason, then I would be prosecuted under the Official Secrets Act.

### *Protection of Privacy*

I am pleased to say that I did tell him. I went straight to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) who was our lawyer. We went to arbitration and the arbitration board went to the then minister of justice, the Hon. Davie Fulton. He appointed a judicial inquiry which found that there was no colour of right at all for the RCMP to have branded this man a security risk. Yet unless this kind of vigorous action on his behalf had been taken, this man's career would have been frozen at a very junior level, and he was a married man with children. The RCMP, this famous agency that the minister wants to let loose with wiretapping equipment for 36 hours at a crack without judicial approval, this finest police force in Canada, made a grievous mistake that very nearly ruined the life of one man and his family, and I dare say this has been repeated many, many times. Certainly it has been repeated at other levels and by various police forces in this country. Certainly, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert and her spiritual leader are not the only ones who would move against organized crime. Many people have suggested how badly we need a policy in respect of wiretapping. As I have said before, what this represents is provision to police forces of a *lettre de cachet*. With this power the police force will not have to bug anyone. If they suspect someone they can put him in the clink until he confesses.

● (1630)

I have had some experience with organized crime. I lived in Montreal for a couple of years during which time I was employed by one of those international labour unions, and I happened to begin by organizing the wrong group of hacks. One night on the way home a long, high-powered, low-slung, black car pulled up alongside. Three men jumped out and beat me within an inch of my life. They told me before they left precisely why they had done it. My leader found out they were operating on a contract from a Mafia person in Montreal who is well-known to my grinning colleagues over there. If someone offered me the chance to have these men apprehended and sent to jail by means of an illegal or unauthorized wiretap, although I bear the scars of the encounter with me to this very day, I would still say "no". I would rather that these men go free, and I mean this, than to have the privacy of individual liberties in Canada interfered with by the police or anybody else.

Let me return to the subject matter at hand. We are discussing whether the bill should be amended to provide that at no time should the police or any other agency be able to interfere with, intercept, transmit or record the private conversation of an individual without the approval of a judge. I suggest to you that I have demonstrated here cases in which both the police and politicians, be they Attorneys General or not, have proven massively fallible, and we have one bulwark in this country against abuse by police power, and that is the judiciary. In my experience this is a fairly reliable bulwark. I think the voluntary giving to police forces a hunting licence to snoop and to pry into people's conversations, and later use that evidence in court, is to limit our civil liberties to an unacceptable extent. I urge all hon. members to vote for the amendment proposed by the right hon. member for Prince Albert.