

*Protection of Privacy*

any way withdraw from remarks made in pursuance of this amending motion in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, where I clearly indicated that its purpose was to draw to the attention of the government and the people of Canada the fact that with the protection of privacy—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. We should do this in a more orderly way. If the hon. member plans to say a few words on motion No. 1 while he is withdrawing it, I would suggest that for the moment at least we stand motion No. 20, which is before the House, and return to it afterwards. Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Atkey:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also thank hon. members for allowing me a moment or two to explain the reason for the withdrawal. There is much yet to be done in the protection of privacy. This bill, which attempts to provide protection for Canadians against bugging, wire-tapping and other forms of electronic eavesdropping is a start but, as I have indicated, in many cases it is only the tip of the iceberg.

To its credit, the government has recognized that there is much to be done in the field of the protection of privacy through the commissioning of a task force report entitled "Privacy and Computers." All Canadians should be alerted to the dangers which this excellent report, brought forward in December, 1972, outlines in detail. I refer only to the dangers of medical data banks, computer credit data banks, police computers and other forms of computer data banks in this country and in the country to the south of us. We see from this that there is virtually no law in existence now to provide any protection for Canadians on such questions as access, security of information—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, but I assure the hon. member that it is a friendly point of order. We have no objection to his request to withdraw motion No. 1, but if in the process he is permitted to say a few words about it, one of my colleagues would like to do the same thing.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. The point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is well taken. Actually, at this time there is no question before the House. The Chair has the option of putting motion No. 1 to the House if the hon. member wants to speak to it. If he does, then of course the Chair will have to allow other hon. members to speak to the motion.

I think it is an unfair practice under our normal procedures to take advantage of a motion being put and being the sole person to speak to it and then to withdraw it. That is not being fair to hon. members. Therefore I would ask the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) to make the choice. If the reason for withdrawing the motion at this time has to be explained in the House, then the Chair will have to allow other hon. members to comment on it.

● (2010)

**Mr. Atkey:** Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the motion. As hon. members appreciate, those of us in the opposition

[Mr. Atkey.]

have perhaps extracted our pound of flesh, and I felt that it was not desirable or in the interests of the swift passage of this bill to proceed any further with the motion. With your permission and the permission of hon. members, I would request leave to withdraw motion No. 1.

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, we certainly would be agreeable to that. I think the withdrawal is far more sensible than the original motion.

**Mr. Leggatt:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are also agreeable to that, but we certainly do not agree with the comment of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) that the suggested title of the bill was put in facetiously. In fact, I am somewhat disappointed it was withdrawn, because it probably more accurately describes the bill that we are going to be faced with on Tuesday than the present title.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Hon. members have heard the hon. member for St. Paul's. Does the House give unanimous consent that motion No. 1 standing in his name be withdrawn?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Atkey) withdrawn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The House will now revert to motion No. 20 standing in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang).

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great care to the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) in dealing with the motion now before us. If I could summarize what he said, it would be in these few words—what real value is there in the notification section? The mere fact that the minister asked that question indicates a great deal to this House.

**Mr. Lang:** I also showed the cost.

**Mr. Leggatt:** We know the minister is concerned with cost. I am sure we all are, but many of us are very concerned with rights. I can understand the minister's approach to this subject, Mr. Speaker, when he asked the question, what value has notification, because anyone who asks that does not really understand what the right to privacy means. The right to privacy is a substantive right, and when the government or the Crown or the police take away that right from an innocent citizen, surely the very least that could be done is to notify the citizen that his rights have been attacked and taken away. That is what the committee said and said very wisely.

It is interesting that there was some concern within the NDP caucus some time ago about the bugging on a Wednesday of a private caucus meeting of our party. In that case the CTV at least had the decency to notify us that they had illegally intercepted our deliberations.

**Mr. Lang:** When they were caught.

**Mr. Leggatt:** Not when they were caught, Mr. Speaker: I think they notified us out of a sheer question of the morality of the issue. I am surprised that the minister takes the position he does with regard to this particular