and perhaps used, not only against the clients but against the lawyers. Just this morning we heard of yet another instance of telephone tapping in Montreal. This time it affected a book-publishing firm which may have published books deemed unacceptable by some police groups which did not agree with what was being printed or published.

These are shocking revelations, yet I am sure hon. member would agree that what we are reading about in all these newspapers in Canada represents only the tip of the iceberg. Electronic surveillance has been used by the police in Canada at all three levels, federal, provincial and municipal. It is an every-day tool of private investigators. It is used by persons involved in negotiating collective bargaining agreements in an effort to obtain an unfair advantage for one of the parties. It is used by various commercial concerns, even by car dealers and operators of dance studios who find it profitable to invade the privacy of actual or potential customers.

I sincerely hope the dangers of the invasion of privacy are now fully apparent to Canadians. Surveillance of this type can destroy the inner soul of an individual. In my work in my constituency, perhaps because of my association with the issue of wiretapping, I have been visited by many unfortunate victims, people who no longer feel they have any privacy, any anonymity, any solitude as is their right as Canadians in a free society. Rightly or wrongly, they believe they have been victims of a bug or a wiretap, and this has so preoccupied their minds as to render them unwell. I have been shocked by what I have seen.

The amendments before us are not directed to the three prohibitions I have outlined. I think we all agree that these prohibitions are useful and that they should be enacted into law as soon as possible. It is with respect to the exceptions to these provisions that disagreement has arisen. I am thinking, for example, of the range and scope of the powers granted to provincial attorneys general or to their agents, to the Solicitor General or his agent to seek authority by various means to invade the privacy of persons suspected of having committed certain offences. How wide should these powers be? What range of offences should be considered in connection with authorization under these provisions? What conditions should exist for judicial approval? Are there any emergency conditions under which judicial approval would not be required? Whether, indeed—as I am sure the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) will argue—there should be any exceptions to the general prohibitions for which the bill provides. The argument is centred on the question whether evidence obtained from an illegal tap, when the prescribed rules have not been followed, would be allowed to be used by the police in subsequent criminal proceedings. I am sure the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) and others will wish to comment on this particular point, and I shall not go into the subject further at this time.

Addressing myself to the wording of motion No. 2, may I say that on July 17 of this year a similar amendment in my name was put before the standing committee. I want to be honest with hon. members and acknowledge that this amendment was put to the vote and that the result was a tie, the tie being broken by the vote of the chairman, a government supporter. So this is not the first time hon. members who have been associated with the committee will be considering the suggestion contained in motion No. 2. What I was attempting to do then, and what I am attempting to do now, is to provide some form of rationale by which the exception allowed in the case of the attorneys general, the Solicitor General, or their agents, can apply to a particular range of offences in connection with which wire tapping or electronic surveillance might seem particularly appropriate.

● (1530)

This committee was controlled by a majority of supporters of the present government. The report reads:

As a general rule, the Committee recommends that each offence be one which carries with it the possibility of imprisonment upon conviction for a period of ten years or more. The Committee recommends that the criminal acts be named individually in the legislation, and suggests the following series of criminal acts as matters which should be included:

Then, the report lists the offences that I have listed in motion No. 2 and continues:

In addition, these methods of investigation should be employed in the suppression of narcotics trafficking and in the control of syndicated crime.

The list of offences that I have included in motion No. 2 were recommended by the standing committee in the last parliament. In addition, I have added several new offences that were not in existence at the time of that recommendation, those being the offences of hijacking aircraft, and endangering the safety of an aircraft by having offensive weapons aboard an aircraft. I have also added the offence of fraud, which is an important white collar crime in which in many cases wiretapping can perhaps be a useful device of law enforcement.

Then, to deal with the matter of syndicated crime, which was of great concern to the standing committee at the time and, I might add, was of great concern to many members of the standing committee in this parliament, I have added additional wording that was not in the original motion put before the standing committee. This wording reads as follows:

—and any pattern of other offences created by an Act of the Parliament of Canada for which an offender may be prosecuted by indictment where there are reasonable grounds to believe that such pattern of offences is part of the activities of organized crime—

So, Mr. Speaker, in addition to listing the 19 offences and adding to them fraud and the three hijacking or aircraft offences, I have added words that will meet the objects of the committee of the last parliament, and I hope the objects of the members of the committee of this parliament, to cover lesser indictable offences that do not carry the penalty of ten years or more but which nevertheless are part of a pattern of offences for which the use of electronic surveillance is a necessary law enforcement device. I think hon. members will remember in committee the example of bookmaking, which in itself is not a serious offence, yet clearly where it is part of a pattern of alleged or suspected offences it would be the proper object of authorized police electronic surveillance.

I should also indicate that the amendment that is now contained in motion No. 2 is different from the one put in committee in another sense. It is different because it