

Protection of Privacy

[English]

Only the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to sign a wiretapping operation, while in Canada it might be someone with a special authorization, whether from the Minister of Justice of Canada or the Attorney General of any province. I think this is too many people. I just want to remind the House that Edgar J. Hoover, the former chief of the FBI, during most of his career never took the responsibility of signing a wiretap; he always asked the Attorney General himself to do it.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, considering the fact that our population is ten times smaller than that of the United States, where problems related to crime are much more important, I suggest that the passage of an even wider legislation than the American one seems to be a nonsense. I believe that the causes of crime are well known, especially social inequities, and its remedies are complex. It is not through such methods that we will solve the problem. The comparison between the advantages and disadvantages shows that in order to achieve security in this country and maintain our citizens' freedom, we should spend more money on our police forces' training rather than resort to a system under which our citizens will never be sure that they are not bugged, and, on the other hand, policemen themselves will be suspected by their fellow-citizens.

Those are the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset of my remarks, I am in conscience opposed to any form of electronic surveillance.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Fairweather: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has asked that motion No. 3, standing in his name, wait until tomorrow. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang), and the spokesman for the NDP, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), were kind enough to agree to this. Presumably, then, the right hon. gentleman could proceed after orders of the day tomorrow. We might, therefore, stand motion No. 2 and start on the next block of amendments. Is that agreeable?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Did the hon. member ask that motion No. 3 be stood, or should we put motion No. 2 and then proceed to motion No. 5?

Mr. Fairweather: Perhaps it could be stood. The mover had to be away tonight at a speaking engagement. Surely we can vote on these amendments in a block.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will listen to whatever the House tells the Chair to listen to. There does not seem to be disagreement about this.

Mr. Lang: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the procedure would be that the question would be put, and if there were a division it would be postponed to a time to be set later, so there would be no question of having the division now. My understanding is that we would then proceed to the next group, that is to say, omit the amendment in the name of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr.

[Mr. De Bané.]

Diefenbaker) and move on to the one in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), continue with that and then go back to the one standing in the name of the hon. member for Prince Albert.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. McKinley: Can we move on to the next group and stand amendment No. 3? I understand the agreement was that beginning with government orders tomorrow, we would start with amendment No. 3.

Mr. Baker: The situation as explained by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McKinley) is as I understand it. There is to be no doubt, as I understand the agreement, that the right hon. member for Prince Albert will start immediately after orders of the day tomorrow with his amendment, and that the debate on his amendment will continue, regardless of what happens tonight, until that matter is completed. If we start on another amendment tonight, then that amendment will be suspended until the motion standing in the name of the right hon. gentleman is completed. That is my understanding of the agreement. If there has not been an agreement in this respect, then we will continue: we are prepared to deal with the amendment that is before the House, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Paul's.

● (2110)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the Chair should state what it understands has been understood. If I am wrong I will no doubt be corrected, as has sometimes happened. The debate on motion No. 2 is completed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I complete my understanding of what I understand, and then no doubt hon. members will correct me. The debate on motion No. 2 has been completed, as I understand it.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The proceedings on motion No. 2 have been suspended for the time being; the proceedings on motion No. 3 will not proceed tonight, but immediately after orders of the day tomorrow. At that time motion No. 3, standing in the name of the right hon. member for Prince Albert, will be called. Then it is suggested that we now proceed to a group of motions in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster, namely, Nos. 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 21, which would take us through the rest of the evening. Am I correct in this understanding?

Mr. Leggatt: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for New Westminster rises on a point of order.

Mr. Leggatt: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the amendments you dealt with before you came to the package of amendments that I have submitted deal with the emergency permit section of the bill. Now there are three amendments on the order paper dealing with the emergency permits, Nos. 3, 4 and 12. I would ask that if we are going to stand Nos. 3 and 4, we stand No. 12 as well. All