

Dental Examining Board

also mentioned two or three items in his remarks which should be considered in committee. I would add my support, Mr. Speaker, so that this bill may move to committee for further study.

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to seeing this bill pass to the committee for further study. The bill was initiated in the other place, and it is good to see the other place doing some work and having something with which to fill their time. Everybody thinks they do not have very much to do, but I recently had a conversation with a senator and he thinks they have far too much to do. It is all a matter of opinion, I suppose.

If this bill will assist in any way to establish more dentists in small towns throughout the country, or make it easier for dentists to be brought from one part of the country to another, I would not want to do anything to stop its passage. We need more dentists in small towns. We know that they generally head for the larger towns and are booked up months ahead.

We would expect the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton), who presented the bill to this House, to make sure that the proper personnel will appear before the committee so they can tell us why the bill should go through and explain any changes that they think should be made to it. I can assure the House that we will have competent people on the committee. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, we see no reason why this bill should not go to committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. The private members' hour having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 o'clock p.m.

At 5:43 the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

[Mr. Foster.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY BILL**CREATION OF OFFENCES RELATED TO INTERCEPTION OF PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS BY CERTAIN DEVICES**

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-176, to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and motion No. 2 (Mr. Atkey).

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, just before five o'clock I had been saying that you could approach Bill C-176 in two ways, the catch-all way of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) as set out in the definition section of the bill, or the catalogue way, as suggested by the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) in his amendment. He wishes to stipulate offences with respect to which authorization should be given. I point out that part of the definition in the bill is included in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. Paul's. Part of clause 2 on page 2 provides:

—"offence" means an offence created by an act of the Parliament of Canada for which an offender may be prosecuted by indictment and includes any such offence that is alleged or suspected or that there are reasonable grounds to believe may be committed—

The last few words of the hon. member's proposed amendment read, "any such offence that is alleged or suspected or that there are reasonable grounds to believe may be committed". Thus, the definition of "offence" in the latter part of the proposed amendment is very close to the definition contained in the bill. It seems to me that both the bill and the amendment are too sweeping in their definitions, and that makes me unhappy. Why do I say that?

Consider the United States approach to this question. They started from a narrow base which included a few offences, those being the more serious offences. Our Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs studied the problem and catalogued the offences which had been covered by the U.S. approach: apparently they considered offences which carried a penalty of ten years imprisonment or more. It was considered that the United States approach was too narrow. Other serious offences were included in later bills which were passed by the U.S. Congress. We have seen what has happened with regard to the application of the U.S. bill. When it was enforced many people experienced severe and serious abuse.

One feature of the motion proposed by the hon. member for St. Paul's gives me particular concern. He wishes the police to obtain authorization for wiretaps when there is evidence of organized crime activity. He suggests that near the end of his amendment. I presume that he included that part in order to gain some support not only from his party but from other parts of the House. I submit that it detracts seriously from the main thrust of his amendment, which would catalogue the more serious offences with respect to which authorization for wiretapping may be given.

May I point out that the spokesman for the Canadian Civil Liberties Association appeared before the committee.