

*Criminal Code*

It infringes on the employees' rights to have assistance from their own employer. Perhaps the bill itself is an example of the futility of careless words.

If this house were permitted during the private members' hour to spend one hour a week hearing speeches by six members of parliament lasting a maximum of ten minutes each on controversial subjects, I respectfully submit that a great deal of time would be saved, time which is now wasted, and that a more interesting debate would result. I suggest that rather than discuss bills of this nature in every private members' hour it would be better to allow more latitude for the discussion of current topics such as bilingualism and national unity, the procedural advancement of parliament from the outdated shackles of the past, or the thought behind the legislation which was under consideration earlier. If we were to proceed in this way I suggest that private members' hour would be far more interesting to hon. members and to the public and that the attendance in this house would increase.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. member would like to return to the subject under discussion and make his suggestion to the procedural committee.

**Mr. Gibson:** I will take the hint. Bills such as the one before the house today lead us nowhere. Ideas such as this are stale and out of context, and discussion of them is a senseless waste of time. The taxpayers are not paying us to deal with a bill which will never get through and which was never intended to get through, such as the one before us today. I therefore wish to express my sincere desire that this measure be defeated as a verbose and badly phrased mixture of words and phrases which would only create complete chaos. There is an old saying that an Englishman's home is his castle. It is certainly true that an Englishman's home is his home, whether it be a rented apartment, a trailer, a house, a tent or hotel room. In each case the occupant is given some protection by the Criminal Code, and the only result of the passing of this bill would be to restrict those rights and freedoms which are so precious to us all.

So let us reject this bill and, once again, resist the trend to cut down the individual's right to be protected from trespass in the just society. Let us guard against relaxing the law of trespass, a word which has changing meanings from generation to generation. With

eavesdropping devices mushrooming in our technological age should we not consider a wider definition of trespass to include unwarranted invasion of privacy? We cannot discuss this fully today in the context of this debate but I feel we should be constantly on our guard to protect the individual's right to justice in a free society.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will permit a personal note. My father was a cabinet minister in the King and St. Laurent governments from 1940 to 1949.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Bell:** Who was King?

**Mr. Gibson:** I hope you will permit me to say how proud I am to follow in his footsteps in this parliament.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that my friends are behind me tonight because it always gives one a good deal of comfort when one is still unaccustomed to these matters.

I was very interested in the maiden speech of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) and in the attitude he took toward these private bills. I think he will find after he has been here a while that private members' bills do provide an opportunity to express a point of view on things which are sometimes left undone by busy governments. In my experience very few private members' bills have passed the House of Commons, but many of them have greatly influenced public opinion and the attitude of the government of the day. Many changes have come about as a result of private members bringing in resolutions and bills. The hon. member said it was a waste of the taxpayers' money to discuss these measures. In the past we used to get a dinner break from six o'clock till eight. Now we sit until seven, so it really does not cost much more of the taxpayers' money. Members are paid the same salaries whether they stay here and listen to me or not, and I note that some have not stayed to listen.

• (6:30 p.m.)

What the hon. member for Winnipeg North is saying, in a nutshell, is this. Many large companies in Canada, particularly mining and lumber companies, own the land upon which the homes of their employees are built. As I gather from the hon. member's argument in proposing this bill, whether he lives in an