

motion No. 1, has a responsibility, of course, in this respect. I think it would be in order to start with the hon. member's motion No. 2. We would then go on to motion No. 3 and the grouping suggested either by the Minister of Justice or the hon. member for New Westminster might be looked at a little more closely. My understanding of the grouping suggested by the minister is that motions Nos. 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 21 and 22 might go together as part of the same debate. The hon. member for New Westminster pointed out that one motion might be left out of this proposed grouping. This might be the subject of discussions outside the House where it might be much easier to reach a decision.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we should not at this moment finalize the subsequent groupings. We can start with motion No. 2. If the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) is prepared to leave motion No. 1 until later, that resolves that issue. I would certainly like to see motions Nos. 3, and 4 in the same debate. I am a little reluctant to agree to eight or 10 motions being put together in one group because there are various issues. Since each member can speak only once on a group of amendments, there might be cases where the mover of several amendments might be wronged in that way. I support Your Honour's suggestion that the actual grouping beyond motion No. 2 be left until there have been some consultations through the usual channels.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their suggestions. We will proceed with motion No. 2 and, unless I am otherwise convinced, motion No. 3 will be dealt with separately as the next item of business. All the others can then be considered.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On that very point, in Your Honour's first grouping you put motions Nos. 3 and 4 together. It seems to me that is a case of two being in the same area.

Mr. Speaker: This will be looked at, as I suggested a moment ago.

Mr. Ron Atkey (St. Paul's) moved:

That Bill C-176, to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 1 to 7 inclusive at page 2 and substituting therefor:

"'offence' means an offence under sections 47 (treason), 51 (intimidating Parliament or legislature), 52 (sabotage), 62 (sedition), 76.1 (hijacking aircraft), 76.2 (endangering safety of aircraft), 76.3 (offensive weapons on aircraft), 78 (breach of duty respecting explosives), 79 (causing injury by explosives with intent), 80 (possessing explosives without lawful excuse), 108 (bribery of judicial officers and legislators), 109 (bribery of public officers), 121 (perjury), 218 (murder), 247 (kidnapping), 303 (robbery), 305 (extortion), 306 (breaking and entering), 338 (fraud), 389 (arson), 421 (a) (b) (attempts, accessories) insofar as they relate to the above offences and 423(1) (a) (b) (conspiracy) insofar as it relates to any of the above offences, or an offence under section 4 (trafficking), and 5 (importing and exporting) of the Narcotic Control Act, and any pattern of other offences created by an Act of the Parliament of Canada for which an offender may be prosecuted by indictment where there are reasonable grounds to believe that such pattern of offences is part of the activities of organized crime, and includes any such offence that is alleged

Protection of Privacy

or suspected or that there are reasonable grounds to believe may be committed;"

He said: Mr. Speaker, in all concern about necessary amendments to this bill, both at the committee stage and report stage, we must never forget that this bill contains three important prohibitions which are urgently needed now, regardless of what happens to the amendments. First, there is a provision that, for the first time, makes wiretapping and electronic surveillance a crime. Until this bill is enacted, electronic surveillance is legal in Canada except to the extent that it may violate the various telephone acts of the provinces. Second, this bill would make possession, sale or purchase of bugging devices a crime. Until this bill is enacted, regardless of what happens to the amendments, the possession, sale or purchase of those invidious devices is legal in Canada. Third, the bill would make disclosure of information obtained by unlawful bugging a crime. Until this bill is enacted, such disclosure remains legal in Canada. These are important protections for Canadians. They are needed now.

Speaking for the official opposition, we will not countenance any further delay of this bill. This bill has already had virtually three lives. It was first introduced over two years ago following the excellent report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of March 11, 1970. Obviously, the government has had other priorities. Frankly, it has not moved very quickly on this bill, yet the public concern over actual and potential threats of invasion of their privacy has grown by leaps and bounds. This is a concern felt in Canada, not only because of the implications of Watergate. A growing number of domestic incidents have frightened many Canadians, and I will take a moment or two in which to list some of these incidents.

● (1520)

We saw the shocking report last June and July in which the wiretapping of the office of the Mayor of Montreal was revealed; wiretaps were also placed on a member of the provincial government of Quebec, on a member of the public service commission in that province, and indeed, a member of the organizing committee responsible for the Olympics. There were other responsible public officials who found their privacy had been invaded. More recently, at the end of October, revelations came to light concerning the operations of certain police groups, as yet undetermined and unknown, in the Province of Quebec conducting what has become known as operation 95 directed against the St. Jean Baptiste Society and its members for doing that which is their right in this country, that is to say, expressing their political views. There was the unfortunate incident involving the bugging of the caucus room of one of the parties represented in this House, a matter which was dealt with swiftly and promptly by Your Honour and other members, the requisite apology being exacted from the television network concerned.

We saw also, in a program on that same network, evidence of the bugging of a union headquarters in Toronto. The persons doing the bugging were unseen, unnamed, but nevertheless very real. Then, just this week we find two members of the legal profession in Montreal complaining that their telephones had been tapped. Obviously, the privacy of communications between them and their clients had been violated, their conversations had been overheard