

*Protection of Privacy***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY BILL**CREATION OF OFFENCES RELATED TO INTERCEPTION OF PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS BY CERTAIN DEVICES**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-176, to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, as reported, (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, a large number of motions appear on the order paper relating to Bill C-176. There will have to be consultations, I am sure, between representatives of the parties as to how these motions might be grouped and how votes might be taken from time to time.

As a preliminary thought and, of course, subject to what hon. members may want to agree on later, I suggest that motions Nos. 1 and 2 be considered separately, and that votes be taken on each of them eventually; that the third item of business in relation to this bill should be motions Nos. 3, 4, 11, 12, 15 and 18, which might be grouped together for debate, subject, of course, to individual votes being taken on each one of them. Because these motions are so complicated and as there is such a close relationship between them, I suggest that they should be grouped as mentioned for purposes of debate. However, it would be helpful for the Chair if consultations were to take place in due course. For the moment, I suggest to hon. members that we might proceed with motion No. 1, in the name of the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey). When that has been disposed of we will go to Motion No. 2. That ought to keep the House busy for some time, at least.

Mr. Lang: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments Your Honour has made about complications in relation to these motions. It would seem to me, however, that there is a certain order of priority which it might be reasonable to consider in relation to these motions. In particular, Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey), might logically be decided last by the House, because of its nature and because it might be affected by other developments. Motions Nos. 2 and 3 likewise would not be necessary if, for instance, the group of motions from No. 4 onward in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) were to be successful.

● (1510)

I submit there might be a grouping of a certain number of motions standing in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), beginning with motion No. 4, and subject to his comments, because I, too, have some difficulty in reading the grouping all together. I think the group which might be included in one debate and one vote with which we might start would include motions Nos. 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 21 and 22. As I perceive it, they all involve the same principle. However, I would appreciate clarification from the hon. member for New Westminster on this point.

[Mr. Muir.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think Your Honour's suggestion would commend itself to most members of this House, namely that the order be Nos. 1 and 2 which bear resemblance one to the other. One deals with the title and the second with the subject matter. From there on, I think we should proceed in the order which Your Honour suggested. I think that would bring about an orderly discussion and debate. Certainly, motion No. 1 should be first, what should this bill be named. It is not like a bill in which the name is approved last because no one is raising any objection to it. If I may say so I feel Your Honour's suggestion was very wise, having regard to all the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is that the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) was inclined to agree with the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang), that perhaps his amendment affecting the title might well be left for the last which would mean we would start with motion No. 2. I again seek the guidance of the hon. member.

Mr. Atkey: Your Honour is quite correct with regard to motion No. 1 relating to the title. The title the bill takes is in large measure a reflection of the content of the bill. I think it is in the interest of all hon. members to see how the House is prepared to dispose of the other amendments before I proceed with my submissions with respect to motion No. 1. However, motion No. 2 is quite an independent matter. This point was argued in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

I am quite prepared to proceed with motion No. 2 at the present time, if that is the wish of Your Honour and hon. members. I agree the other grouping of amendments subsequent to motion No. 3, that is motions Nos. 4 through 22, tend to group together, particularly the amendments standing in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). I think that is a separate debate, unrelated to the issue in motion No. 2. If it is Your Honour's pleasure and the wish of hon. members, I will proceed with motion No. 2 at the present time.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse what the minister suggested in terms of the grouping with the exception of one amendment, that dealing with the removal of the emergency permit. That is a separate issue. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has proposed a similar amendment. I feel those two could be dealt with at the same time. It would not be necessary to group the emergency permit amendment with the other amendments I have proposed which are basically the pure position, if I could put it that way, with regard to wire-tapping under the Criminal Code.

In spite of what the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) has said, I support what the right hon. member said. I do not see why we should delay dealing with the question of the title. In my view, this is the more appropriate title in view of the nature of the bill and the likely outcome of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the difficulties, I suggest we agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for St. Paul's in relation to motion No. 1. The hon. member who has the carriage of the action on