

the crux of the matter. He thinks that the reporting requirement in the bill will solve his problems, and his anxieties will be answered—but that is not so.

We have seen various Ministers of Justice over the years. Since 1965 I have seen at least three or four. In Ontario I have seen various Ministers of Justice and Attorneys General; they have all had different attitudes with regard to problems like these. I, for one, am chary with regard to giving them too much power and at the same time an excuse with regard to this important section of the bill. Therefore, I urge the hon. member for St. Paul's and his colleagues to support this amendment which will strengthen the bill, avoid abuses that may take place, and make this far better legislation for the protection of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on Bill C-176 and more specifically on amendments Nos. 8, 17 and 18 aimed at replacing the word "agent" in clause 178.12.

We all know that this clause deals with applications for authorization. While speaking recently on this legislation I have stated my concern, which is shared by many other hon. members, about the political pressures which might be exerted when a wire-tapping application is made.

While generally supporting this bill as well as the principle of wiretapping, since this is one way among others to fight organized crime, it remains that Parliament should ensure that the political power will not exert direct pressures for political purposes as far as wiretapping is concerned. This is how I conceive clause 178.12 since the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is ultimately responsible for empowering someone to authorize wiretapping.

I would like to make a few brief remarks. I will join the excellent remarks of the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) who stated this afternoon that we should obviously give all possible facilities to our law enforcement officers to fight organized crime efficiently. Moreover, I am sure the hon. member for Louis-Hébert will also agree that this must not be done for the benefit of particular political interests but to protect society as a whole. Here is what concerns me; subclause (a) reads and I quote:

(a) the Solicitor General of Canada personally, if the offence under investigation is one in respect of which proceedings, if any, may be instituted at the instance of the Government of Canada and conducted by or on behalf of the Attorney General of Canada, or

Then it goes on describing circumstances requiring that it be accompanied by:

an affidavit which may be sworn on the information and belief of a peace officer or public officer deposing to the following matters, namely:

Mr. Speaker, what has me worried is the too direct intervention of the political power in the judiciary power. Perhaps some of my colleagues of the other parties will not share my point of view, but experience to date has shown that the judiciary and political powers are too often related. Finally, the population can rightfully ask what is the real distinction between the judiciary, legislative and executive powers.

Protection of Privacy

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that specific procedures must be found to enable the judiciary to act by itself so that it can be dissociated from the political power. This is why I welcome with interest the proposed amendments. I for one intend to support them since the bill offers no such assurances.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I circulated through the usual channels the proposal, on which I think there is general agreement, that we defer the vote on this motion to the time when votes are taken at a later date.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): I understand that, but I still have to put the question.

Mr. Lang: It is agreeable, Mr. Speaker, if we can now agree that the debate on this matter is concluded and the question will be put at a later date which will be arranged by agreement. This will avoid having a division now.

Mr. Atkey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Speaking for the official opposition, let me say that this is in accordance with my understanding of the arrangement, namely, that the vote will be deferred until a later time which is to be agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we do not mind this arrangement—in fact, under certain circumstances it would be welcome—but we would be willing to regard the debate on this motion as concluded. We could order the vote, but have it deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): On behalf of the fourth party but not the least in importance, I wish to say that it is not against the proposal and we hope that this debate will end as soon as possible.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The question is on motions Nos. 8, 17 and 18. All those in favour will please say yea.

● (2020)

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motions stands deferred. I will now have to ask the minister where we go from here.