

occasions hamstringing in their attempts to deal with criminal elements. That is essentially the case to be made on behalf of the bill in its present form.

The amendment goes much too far. Argument might be advanced as to whether permits should be issued by an agent or not, but should not go as far as the right hon. gentleman has proposed. The arguments he puts forward are nothing but a sham and hypocrisy. There can be no other course but for the House to support the bill as it stands before us.

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I had intended to remain silent and enjoy the debate this afternoon until an attack was made on the life's work of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) by a lawyer whose acquaintanceship with the practise of law, as compared with the right hon. member for Prince Albert and his experience of the courts, can only be called scant. It is interesting that with respect to the services of the right hon. gentleman to the people of Canada, the criticism of that service and the criticism of the things he has done in the name of justice should be made by a member of the bar who, if I may put it frankly, in terms of service is not worthy of being a pimple on the neck of the right hon. gentleman.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is missing the point. I am not relying on my own opinion to attack the right hon. member for Prince Albert. I am saying that the Supreme Court of Canada has made this judgment on his life's work.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. I should like to remind hon. members that we are debating motion No. 3. If the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) wishes to speak on that, the Chair will be pleased to hear him.

**Mr. Baker:** If I may say so, and I will leave the matter at this point, I think it is important that everyone should remember that this attack was made on the right hon. member for Prince Albert while he was not in the chamber.

**An hon. Member:** He walked out.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, when I began speaking the right hon. gentleman was in the House. As I was speaking, he walked out.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** It is getting close to four o'clock, and no doubt hon. members are anxious to proceed to the private members' hour. However, I think we should remain in order and resume consideration of motion No. 3.

**Mr. Baker:** I am coming to that. The fact that the right hon. gentleman left the House may be some indication of the quality of the speech made by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan). I think it is important we should not allow the spirit of the amendment we are discussing today to be submerged by the catcalls, by the personal attack and, indeed, the personal vendetta—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

### *National Recreation Policy*

**Mr. Baker:** —being carried on by members of the House who sit opposite, behind a Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) who stands against the principles set forth in the amendment put forward by the right hon. member for Prince Albert. The principle is sound. Perhaps I may state it simply so that even some members on the other side can understand, if they refuse to read.

No person, no organization, no police force, no agency, public or private, shall have the right, in the event of an emergency whether real or imagined, to interfere with the privacy of any citizen unless that interference is sanctioned by the courts and under due process of law. If there is anything wrong with the principle which has been advanced by my right hon. friend, then there are many men and women in the country and in this House who cannot agree with those who find it is wrong in the seventies to live by the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it four o'clock?

\* \* \*

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, there is a question regarding House business which was left undefined. Is it the intention of the government to go ahead with this measure, which seems to be taking on a long-term aspect, or switch back to some other piece of legislation on Monday?

**Mr. Lang:** There have been some discussions, Mr. Speaker. We propose to continue with the Foreign Investment Review Act on Monday in the hope of completing third reading that day, and then continue with the measure presently before the House. We plan to proceed with the protection of privacy bill on Tuesday in any case.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills and private bills.

[English]

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

#### SOCIAL AFFAIRS

#### SUGGESTED NATIONAL RECREATION POLICY

**Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)** moved:

That in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the sponsorship and financing of a national recreation policy, in conjunction with the provinces and municipalities, to the allocation of responsibilities for recreational programming, to the determination of land use and to the encouragement of all aspects of recreational development by local citizens under permanent, federally-assisted programs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see so many members in the House this afternoon. Perhaps this is an indication of the way in which hon. members approach the subject of recreation, deeming it to be one of great impor-