

Computer Crime

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I am participating now in this debate on the point that Private Members' Hour, as a result of the motion made under 8(4)(a) that the Private Members' Hour be extended, technically could go on all through the night and well into tomorrow, if that is the interpretation. Therefore, there is a conflict with the rule.

Needless to say, I do appreciate the opportunity of having such a large audience on this particular and very important Bill. I can understand the Opposition Members being here because last year they were defeated nine to zip in the hockey game and probably do not want to go out and see the game that is being played this evening between the Government and the Opposition Members.

To be serious, this is a very important Bill. I think the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) made the point that technology all too often outpaces the legislation that we need in order to cope with it and keep it on the rails, as it were. We find ourselves worrying about the intention or the meaning of a particular word. We find ourselves wondering if this is going to be inclusive enough. We find ourselves wondering if, as a result of bringing in new legislation, we may not impede communication, which was never intended by the legislation at all.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate the desire of the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) to speak on this matter. Without being too strict on relevancy, should the Hon. Member not direct his attention to the question of whether or not we vote immediately?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I thought you had already ruled on that. You indicated that the motion put by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) was that the question be now put. You had ruled that as long as people wanted to debate, the debate on the main motion would continue. That is the basis on which I was rising.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton is quite correct. I did quote the proper citation. It is very clear that once the Speaker has proposed the motion on the previous question to the House, and I will quote the citation from Beauchesne which reads:

452(1)—the debate may continue on the original question.

This is what is happening. I appreciate the fact that Hon. Members may want to seek clarification, and I am aware of the fact they are not questioning the Chair's ruling. We are operating under new and unusual circumstances. Therefore, the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton may continue.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I find the Hon. Member's remarks fascinating and, had he read the Bill, I am sure they would have been even more interesting. However, I am seeking some clarification from you, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand that the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) and his motion is deemed to be out of order?

• (1835)

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Beatty: May I ask you what it is that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton is debating? Is he debating the motion of my colleague from Bow River, in which case his remarks are irrelevant, or is he debating the main motion, in which case we will have to decide how to dispose of my colleague's motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. With respect, we will dispose of the motion put by the Hon. Member for Bow River once debate on it has ceased. But what debate is all about at this stage, in view of the fact that the previous question has been put, is that debate may continue on the original question. We are dealing with the Hon. Member's motion at this time. Debate continues on the main motion. That is the interpretation Hon. Members have to reach when reading Citation 452 of Beauchesne. The motion that the question be now put is simply, I am informed, a device to prevent an amendment from being put. Therefore, debate continues on the main motion. These matters do not happen very frequently. I hope we all agree on the interpretation that I am attempting to give at this time.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am rising under the guise of a point of order to seek further clarification from you. As I understand it, the practical, realistic effect of what has happened here now is that it is impossible to talk out this Bill under these circumstances. As long as there is a Member in the House who desires to speak on this motion, he can speak on this motion. If the time comes, and I say if the time comes, when there is no longer a Member in the House who desires to speak, then the question will be put and a vote will be taken. Is that correct, and is it a realistic interpretation of the circumstances in which the House is now? If that is the situation, and if there are no Government Members on the other side with the exception of the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton who desires to speak, I wonder whether discussions and negotiations could not take place so that at the cessation of the very worthwhile contribution that we are going to hear from the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton we could have a vote on the question.

Mr. MacBain: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I have spoken to the Hon. Member who proposed this Bill. I suggested to him that the subject matter of this Bill, which is one of great importance, be referred to the committee rather than the Bill itself. On behalf of the Minister, I would consent to that. If the House is agreeable, we could dispose of that matter. It would be a job well done, and we could get out of here.

• (1840)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): With due respect to the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, he is injecting a new and