

Protection of Privacy

lined or rewritten so that it would contain no ambiguity. I believe the hon. member is trying to narrow it down. There may be a simpler way to do it. Perhaps the Minister of Justice, through his officials, who have had more experience, certainly, than I have may be able to come up with a formula to do what the hon. member is trying to do, that is, ensure that there is no ambiguity and that justice not only will be done but will appear to be done.

● (1510)

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I rise first of all on a point of order. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) reverted to motion No. 2, and I am not sure whether that is the end of the debate on that motion so far as the official opposition is concerned. They might want to call the question. As I understood it, the vote was to be deferred.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Perhaps I should intervene at this time to inform the hon. member of the situation. I do not know whether he was in the House at the time, but unanimous consent was given to the hon. member for Calgary North to allow him to deal with the two amendments. The Chair was very cautious at the time and indicated to hon. members that this should not be considered as permission to everyone to enter into the debate on both amendments at the same time.

I do not know why the hon. member was asking for this permission, but he received it with the consent of the House. I would hope, however, that hon. members would now come back to the debate on motion No. 3, which is to be followed by the debate on motion No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey).

Mr. Cullen: I was in the House last night and had the impression that the hon. member for Calgary North was the last speaker. That is why I thought there might be consensus to winding up the debate on the motion. However, I do not wish to speak on that particular motion. I heard the "no" from the deputy House leader and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), so I will now proceed to the amendment of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker).

First, I might say—this has been reiterated over and over again in the House—that there is really no objection to this bill and that which it seeks to do. Last night when the hon. member for St. Paul's was introducing his motion he carefully catalogued all the reasons, or a good number of them, for our needing a bill of this nature, particularly at this time as highlighted by the unfortunate experience of our good friends to the south. In addition to the cataloguing that the hon. member did then, just this morning I received a communication from a lady in my riding who says in her letter:

Having had wiretapping and bugging done to us, I know what it means.

She goes on to explain the circumstances. Her husband was involved in a car accident. The case that was made against him turned out to be as the result of private conversations they had had in their living room; that was the only place where the particular evidence had been

[Mr. Woolliams.]

discussed. She was satisfied that they had probably been investigated by a private investigator, that their home had been bugged and their private conversations listened to. This is the tragic part of it. She writes:

You don't know what it means that they lived your private life with you. This is more than three years ago we found out that this was done, and I still have nightmares. If we want to talk something confidential, we walk the street, for I don't trust anything any more.

This is the kind of impact that wiretapping or bugging has on individual citizens in this country, and we know that it is taking place. So I welcomed it when the minister indicated that he would be bringing in a bill to control this kind of abuse of our civil liberties.

Having said that, I should now like to turn to the kinds of problems that have been raised by the hon. member for St. Paul's, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), and today the right hon. member for Prince Albert in the amendment that he is suggesting. I must say, as one who is more than a little concerned about the invasion of privacy, that this is an area that has caused me to do some soul-searching to decide what position I would take with regard to these amendments.

I resented the implication by the right hon. member for Prince Albert that pressure had been brought to bear, or that we had an overbearing Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang), because in point of fact the position taken by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) yesterday was indicative of the fact that the Minister of Justice does not take an overbearing or inflexible position, that he recognizes that the hon. member for Matane as a matter of conscience, felt it was necessary to take the position that he took on the amendments introduced by the hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister is just stubborn.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cullen: I listened with as much courtesy as I could muster to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather), and I think he could extend the same courtesy to me. If he has something to say, he might rise and say it because it is difficult for me to make a speech and to answer his questions at the same time. The hon. member has the respect of all members of the House, and if he has something to say I would be happy to sit down and listen to him.

First of all, dealing with the decision that has to be made and the one we are debating at this time in the amendment that has been moved by the right hon. member for Prince Albert, I understand his reason in bringing in this particular motion. It is something that I have considered very carefully. Although I did not serve on the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, I read all the evidence very carefully, not only the evidence of the former attorney general of the United States but also the evidence of the police. It seems to me that we concentrate too much on this particular section which gives emergency powers to the police. I think the right hon. member has used hyperbole and ridicule to try to downgrade the necessity for having this section in the bill.