Finally, to streamline the process applicable to evidence gathered through electronic surveillance. Streamline is a big word. Does streamline mean that you lose some of the procedures that you must have so you can get a judge, a judicial officer or justice of the peace to properly examine why they want a warrant? You do not want to make it impossible for the police to get a warrant. On the other hand, you do not want to set up a system that is easily abused.

It is not easy. We have had a lot of experience with wire–tapping, some good, some bad. I would like to hear from some of the lawyers and the police who have been involved in that.

We do not intend to delay this. I know there are other members who want to say something on this. I will conclude there. As I say, I hope the bill goes to committee, gets fairly speedy passage but is actually looked at it in some detail.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have studied this bill and I have done an analysis of the bill. I have listened to two speakers, the justice critic from the Official Opposition and the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, who is the justice critic for the New Democratic Party. They are two people who serve on the justice committee with me for whom I have a great respect. I know they have great respect within their own parties.

Both of them said that they would like to see this bill with some inadequacies moved on division into committee. Therefore I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to seek unanimous consent of the House to have this bill moved into committee.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the hon. member's interest in the bill and I think there is a general disposition to pass it. On the other hand I think there are some members of the House who would like to debate the bill. Unfortunately the government leaves very little time for the opposition to have an opportunity to debate government bills. We usually get closure after an hour of two of debate. If there was a little more reasonableness in the amount of time that is allowed for members to do this we probably would have been through it. Unfortunately we have run out of time today. I would suggest we leave it and call the bill again the

week after next when we are back and I expect that after an hour or two of debate it will receive second reading and be referred to committee.

• (1500)

I am sure it is not planning to have the committee sit next week.

Mr. MacWilliam: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is true there is general agreement in allowing the bill to proceed to committee.

I might remind the hon. member on the other side that the bill has essentially a twofold intent, and in that respect responsibilities in the bill are somewhat divided. Some of the areas of responsibility certainly come into the area of the Minister of Communications—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We are going into the realm of debate now. I see there is no unanimous agreement. Therefore, it being three o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

EUTHANASIA

TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS

The House resumed from February 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Waddell:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation on the subject of euthanasia and, in particular, of ensuring that those assisting terminally–ill patients who wish to die not be subject to criminal liability.

Mr. Doug Fee (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam is asking the government in his motion to consider the advisability of introducing euthanasia legislation, exempting from criminal liability those assisting terminally ill patients who wish to die. He is asking the government in the name of compassion to legalize murder. I want to add my name to those who think that our compassion would be better served by expanding palliative care and pain relief rather than endorsing the killing of people.