

party's name has been changed to that of the great reactionary party.

I recall hearing the story one night of a young Jewish rabbi, just graduated from the seminary, who went to the old rabbi and asked, "Would you give me some advice?" The old rabbi replied, "You go down in the market place of life for a while. That is the best advice I can give you." When I look at the Minister of Justice I realize that his training and experience have been in law school. When I compare him with a former minister of justice, I note the difference. That former minister not only had the academic experience but the practical experience.

If I had anything to do with the training of law professors I would make it a requirement that they go into the marketplace of life before becoming professors. And I would pass that suggestion on to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) also. If people like that want to become fully fledged professors, there should be a requirement that they go into the practice of law for at least five or six years to get the real touch of things.

● (2130)

It may be that we in this party and our friends in the Conservative Party would not be calling future ministers of justice arrogant, overzealous, rigid, inflexible, and so forth. That may be the result, Mr. Speaker, and I think it would be an excellent result because every measure that has been brought forth, every motion to improve the bill, has met with tremendous resistance from the Minister of Justice. There has almost been an apology from the hon. member from Windsor-Walkerville who has hopped from one side of the House to the other with his compromise amendments to the motions. It has been a rather disappointing display on the part of government members.

I think the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has set forth some of the dangers. I might add that I am very happy that we made sure that any authorization under the bill will be by way of an application to a judge. When the former minister of justice had conduct of a bill similar to this, it was his attitude that there should be political accountability and that the application should be made to the attorney general. I went along with that and saw the wisdom of it. After the experience we have had in the debate on second reading and the debate in committee, I think it is protection to people that the application for an authorization has to be made to the judge. This is the conclusion I have come to after our experience in committee, with the resistance and the inflexible attitude of the Minister of Justice in regard to this matter.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Yukon set forth the dangers. If we can make it a requirement that the police must get judicial authorization for an indictable offence, and we now know the list of offences that they have to apply or which gives them the authority to apply, I see no reason why the same should not apply with regard to national security. I appreciate the strong point that the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) made with regard to the War Measures Act. One of the things that has had the strongest impact on my life was the action taken by the Liberal government in the days of Mackenzie King when it passed legislation to deport Japanese Canadians. As my hon. friend from Winnipeg North

Protection of Privacy

Centre (Mr. Knowles) says, it was an order in council. If there is anything that made me a socialist, it was that particular action by the Liberal government.

I recall, as well, the former prime minister, Mr. Pearson, having to tell the RCMP to lay off university students on the campuses. This was because of the overzealous attitude of the RCMP with regard to subversive matters. In this instance, the first minister of the Crown had to tell the RCMP to stop their harassment of university students.

I see nothing wrong in having the Solicitor General make an application to a judge for an order with regard to national security—nothing wrong whatsoever. The minister says that this is a very sensitive area, and I agree. But the sensitiveness of the area can be taken care of quite easily in the affidavit that would be submitted. Mr. Speaker, the application is *ex parte* and the content of the affidavit can be taken care of quite easily. There should not be any difficulty whatsoever. This would be a protection and would add to the prestige of the Solicitor General.

We have found the present Solicitor General to be very fair-minded, co-operative and understanding. I think it would add to his prestige and the security and protection of Canadians if he were to agree that whenever an application is made for an authorization, it should be by way of a judge rather than by way of the RCMP. It would impose a great responsibility on the Solicitor General—far too great a responsibility because there is a political element attached to national security measures. I would think it wise to accept the motion of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) that the application for authorization must be made to the judge. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we give full endorsement to the motion of the hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on this matter for a few moments. I listened while the former dean of a law school took his academic podium and lectured a former attorney general of a province, who also has some experience in the law as well as experience in this House, about his attitude with respect to ministers of the Crown. Although I have not taken much part in this debate, having consulted with those in this party who have taken part in it, and having sat through most of it in the House, I want to say that in the last few days we have been dealing with a bill that affects every Canadian. We have had from the Attorney General of this country perhaps one of the worst examples of rigidity, arrogance and overzealousness, and as a result of holding for too long positions which were untenable in the interests of justice this Attorney General has been made to capitulate. I think the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) was right when he suggested that he is not like the former attorney general, now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) who, while I have some doubts about his capabilities as Minister of Finance, I have absolutely none with respect to his abilities as Minister of Justice. There is as much difference between that last mentioned gentleman and the present Attorney General as there is between night and day.

I was not in this House during the "October crisis", as it is called, but I was a very concerned and observant Canadian. I accepted at the time, on representations made