

some of the main problems affecting the peace and security of most Canadians. If the motion of the hon. member for Calgary North were accepted, this bill, for all intents and purposes, would be killed.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a question of privilege. I do not know how much clearer I can put it to the distinguished member. If the hon. member reads the motion, he will see it clearly states that the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs can direct that the bill be severed, sent back to this House and debated in the normal way on the five points. If he does not understand that, then I am sorry for him.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Now, Stanley, you stay out of it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Why should I stay out of it? It is a point of order which is being used to try to twist the situation. The motion which the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) made yesterday is very clear. It asks that the bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter be referred to a committee. The hon. member stated that his purpose is to get that committee to recommend the splitting of the bill. However, if his motion were to carry the committee would not have the bill: it would have only the subject matter. Notwithstanding what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) tried to say, that would be the end of the bill for this session.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** No.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It has been ruled scores of times that a motion to refer to committee the subject matter of a bill precludes its second reading. If you do not give the bill second reading, there is no bill.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on this question of privilege. Clearly, what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says is so, if the government does not act. Surely, if the government is intent upon the provisions of the bill as they now stand, and I take it they acted seriously, if the hon. member's amendment passes and the bill goes back to the committee—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Not the bill.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** If the subject matter went back to the committee, and the committee made a recommendation—which it would do with reasonable speed because the object of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is so clear and so helpful to the House that they would so act—it would still be the intent of the Minister of Justice to bring that new bill into the House of Commons, and the House would deal with them properly. That was the whole point of the argument made yesterday and the day before by the colleague of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I do not know how that party can suck and blow at the same time.

### *Criminal Code*

**Mr. Leggatt:** You want to kill the bill. We do not.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** A very eloquent argument was made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) that it was immoral and wrong for the bill to be dealt with in that way. What the hon. member for Calgary North has done is provide a way for this House to deal with the subject matter of the bill properly and in accordance with the position taken by the hon. member for New Westminster.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, if I could answer the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I would like to ask the distinguished member what we are talking about when the subject matter goes back to the committee. Let's not play ducks and drakes with words. The bill is full of subject matter. It is made up of five things. What are those five distinct things? There are the questions of gun control, electronic surveillance, dangerous offenders, parole, and prison reform. That is the subject matter of the bill. When the subject matter goes to the committee, the bill goes to the committee.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** No, not the bill.

**Mr. Woolliams:** If that is not the procedure of the House of Commons, then there is something wrong with it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Order, please. The point raised by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is well taken. I do not think any hon. member should reflect on the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Calgary North. I would therefore suggest that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) should resume debate on Bill C-51.

**Mr. Gilbert:** Mr. Speaker, I and many others are very concerned about the problem of peace and security for most Canadians. It is the intention of those of us in the New Democratic Party to vote for the bill because of the necessity to ensure the safety of Canadians, even though parts of the bill restrict their fundamental freedoms.

I was hoping the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) would speak before me. I was going to say that the provisions with which he is going to deal, dangerous offenders and release of inmates from custody, concern the effects of crime and not the cause. Therefore, we in the New Democratic Party find it is necessary to support the legislation in order to give a small measure of security at the price of infringement of personal liberties.

What is the problem? On March 8, 1976, on the introduction of second reading of Bill C-83, the Minister of Justice set forth the problems in Canada concerning peace and security. This is what he said, as recorded on page 3 of his statement:

● (1550)

Few would dispute that many people today are deeply and genuinely concerned about the increasing incidence of criminal violence, the growing penetration of organized criminals in our midst, the number of accused or convicted offenders on the streets committing further crimes and the difficulties the system of justice has in coping with criminal activities.