

'tion referred to in subsection (2), set forth'

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the motions of the Minister of Justice, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) in respect of four amendments, as a consequence of earlier proceedings this afternoon. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the four motions as presented by the minister?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motions (Mr. Lang) agreed to.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the next items, which I take it would be Nos. 19 and 20, I should like to indicate that there has been discussion and seems to be general agreement—and if that should be so I would appreciate it being made an order of the House—that the divisions which may be standing, and which may stand after the report stage debate is completed, be voted upon when orders of the day are called on Tuesday next and, if it is thought desirable by the House leaders, that third reading might proceed following that voting.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure about that. So far as the voting is concerned sometime on Tuesday is all right, but there should be no denial of the right of discussion on third reading.

Mr. Lang: There was no intention to indicate that there would be any denial of the right of discussion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister said that immediately after the orders of the day a vote would be taken.

Mr. Lang: The vote would be taken, then third reading would be called and there could be debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I see no need to defer the votes until Tuesday, but if that is agreed to we will go along with it and also join in the necessary unanimous consent so that the third reading motion may be called, and debated if desirable, on the same day the report stage divisions take place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion of the Minister of Justice that the divisions at the report stage on Bill C-176 take place after the routine proceedings and the question period on Tuesday next, to be followed after the divisions by the motion for third reading and any debate which arises from that motion. Is this agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for St. Paul's rising on a point of order?

Mr. Atkey: No, Mr. Speaker. I am rising to speak to the next motion to be called which I believe is motion No. 19.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With regard to motions Nos. 19 and 20 it is the feeling of the Chair, perhaps hopefully shared by the hon. member, that they might be grouped for the purpose of the debate and that an affirmative vote on motion No. 19 would also dispose of motion No. 20. Does any point of order arise from this?

Protection of Privacy

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What would a negative vote do?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for St. Paul's rising on the point of order raised by the Chair?

Mr. Atkey: Mr. Speaker, I anticipated the suggestion made by the Chair, but I should point out to Your Honour and to hon. members that motion No. 19 really is a housekeeping type of motion made, I think, with the agreement of the majority of the members of the committee. It relates to cleaning up an amendment which had been passed prior to the subsequent adoption of further amendments which made necessary the motion standing in my name. I think it would facilitate discussion on the main issue, as brought to the floor by motion No. 20 in the name of the Minister of Justice, if we would first deal with motion No. 19 and get it out of the way. Then, we would have a clear run on motion No. 20.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with that. Essentially, I have no argument whatever with the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Paul's, assuming that section remains in the bill. I think, so long as it does not interfere with the right to have a full debate on the section remaining in the bill, we would find the change proposed by the hon. member for St. Paul's agreeable and then we could have debate on the main question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I take it that it is the wish that the House proceed to the consideration of motion No. 19.

Mr. Ron Atkey (St. Paul's) moved:

No. 19

That Bill C-176 to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be amended in clause 2 by deleting lines 8 to 12 inclusive at page 19 and substituting therefor:

'in the case of a warrant issued under section 16(2) of the *Official Secrets Act*.'

Motion (Mr. Atkey) agreed to.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice) moved:

No. 20

That Bill C-176, to amend the Criminal Code, The Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be amended by striking out lines 38 to 43 at page 18 and lines 1 to 26 at page 19.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of putting this motion before the House is to have the House consider once again the question of the utility, on the one hand, of requiring notice such as this to be given and, on the other hand, of examining the problems which may be created by requiring that notice and considering, therefore, the balance of convenience which is involved. The section refers strictly to those cases where authorizations have been obtained. Therefore, it should be obvious to hon. members that we are dealing with an area wherein investigation is going on by law enforcement officers, where they have presented a case to a judge and obtained the necessary authorization to use an electronic device and that that use of the electronic device has served its purpose. It is at that point the question arises whether notice should be given to the person who was the subject of that particular kind of investigation.