marginal, unrelated amendments which are designed to frustrate parliament, and which always result in delay and holds up the process of parliament.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be moving an amendment to the motion for second reading, and the amendment will be to the effect that the bill be not read a second time but sent to the justice and legal affairs committee for study. I found that necessary when we dealt last year with Bill C-83, and although there was some question as to the right to move such an amendment at second reading stage, the Chair upheld that particular amendment. It will therefore not be necessary for me at any stage, I hope, to spend time presenting arguments in view of that precedent.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Chair directed that, if I were to leave out one phrase, the amendment which I moved to Bill C-83 was in order. Naturally having run the risk once and succeeded, I have followed the exact words of the amendment which was approved by the Chair then, and therefore the Chair will have no difficulty finding my amendment in order.

The purpose of this study will be to have the bill appropriately severed and to show ministers that they cannot in this parliament, as they did in the last parliament with Bill C-83, run roughshod over this institution, its processes and its procedures. Our party fought a long, tiresome and tedious fight not only to have the bill severed, with the support of members of other parties in the opposition, but to have changes made to the gun control legislation. We moved many amendments to Bill C-83; I think at one stage we had 34 amendments lined up. As a result, we can at least say there has been much improvement. In that regard I agree with the minister, and I will have something to say about that a little later this afternoon.

I wish now to zero in on what I consider the most damaging effect of part of this legislation, and in presenting this argument the House will see the reasons why the bill should be severed. This bill, under the heading of "electronic surveillance", makes very substantial amendments to that part of the Code entitled "Invasion of Privacy", known as "Interception of Communications".

Pausing there, Mr. Speaker, it is true that this matter was before the committee on several occasions. Once in 1972 or thereabouts the matter was sent to committee by reference. At that time Mr. Turner was minister of justice, and the only authorization that he wanted to wiretap or to bug was to have the Solicitor General and the Attorney General of Canada merely sign a slip of paper. I took great exception to that and said we should never allow bugging to be authorized without a judge's order. So Mr. Turner repented after speaking to members of the Canadian Bar, who did not like it either.

Mr. Paproski: Then he resigned.

Mr. Woolliams: It was a little later when he resigned and went home. Then the matter came before the committee after what we call the short parliament, and as a result of the efforts of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) and the then hon. member for St. Paul's, Mr. Ron Atkey, and with co-operation from the other parties, amendments were made to protect the citizen against erosion of freedom, and for this I think we can take credit.

The minister quoted me, Mr. Speaker, but he quoted me somewhat out of context. I was dealing with the fact that I was at least happy to have part of the act amended. The minister wanted to abolish notice altogether but I did not want it changed. Since then, I might say, I have learned a lot. I suppose a lawyer is always a student. When you share an office with your partner, as I do, and you have communications between solicitor and client being listened to and the Crown admitting those communications as evidence, then you have to take a hard look at the precedents—*stare decisis*, as the minister knows—to see how the court is interpreting this legislation and, above all, how the police are using it. Therefore when the minister quoted my affection for his amendment, it was affection for half an apple, because half an apple when you are hungry is better than no apple at all.

Trial lawyers, professors of various law schools, and learned newspaper writers on the subject—and I particularly want to congratulate the *Globe and Mail*—are well aware of the abuse that the law authorities have been guilty of in the application of the law as it now stands. Therefore when we give law authorities more power, we are assuring the erosion of the freedom and liberty of the subject as to his or her privacy, and are creating a new era of further invasion of privacy, and assuring a greater authoritarian state. That I will oppose.

What are the amendments in question which I challenge, Mr. Speaker? First of all, the granting of an authorization will be extended from 30 days to 60 days, doubling the time for invasion of privacy. That is a 100 per cent gain. Second, the minister wants to abolish absolutely the necessity to give the person who is the object of wiretapping a notice within 90 days that he has been subject to electronic surveillance of some kind—having his phone tapped, his place of residence or office bugged, or his means of transportation.

In regard to written notification to be given, there is an exception under Martin's Criminal Code, 1976, page 118, section 178.23(1), which provides:

> The Attorney General of the province in which the application was made or the Solicitor General of Canada, as the case may be, shall notify in writing within 90 days next following the period for which the authorization was given . . .

Now the period is to be extended to three years, or it could be up to three years. What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker? We were fooled in Bill C-83. The minister was so eloquent when he said that that was one of the greatest pieces of legislation ever to be brought down, but I do not want any member to be fooled today. The minister used much affection and eloquence in telling us today what a great bill we have before us, but what change has been made? Notice can be given up to three years, or within a shorter time. I can say from my experience that when the police draw up the usual order it will always contain the three year clause whenever a lawyer's office is to be bugged. They will then listen in to communications between a lawyer and his client, and a case