

Paul's. In considering the matter, it is important for hon. members not to lose sight of the fact that despite all the exceptions this bill, basically, is a bill to prevent wiretapping. I think everyone in the House agrees with that. Heated debate has been generated by the exceptions that are included in the bill and about the conditions under which wiretapping should be carried out. Nevertheless, we should not in this debate lose sight of the fact that the main purpose of the bill is to prevent wiretapping.

On that basis, and not wishing to belabour the point, I move:

That motion No. 2 to amend Bill C-176, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be amended by deleting the quoted text therein and substituting the following:

"offence" means an offence contrary to or any conspiracy or attempt to commit or being accessory after the fact in relation to sections 47, 51, 52, 58, 62, 76.1, 76.2, 76.3, 78, 79, 80, 108, 109, 110, 121, 178.11, 178.18, 218, 247, 281.1, 303, 305, 306, 312, 314, 325, 326, 331, 338, 339, 383, 389, 407, 408, 410, paragraph 186(1)(e) and paragraph 294(a); sections 4 and 5 of the Narcotic Control Act; sections 34 and 42 of the Food and Drugs Act; section 192 of the Customs Act; unlawful distillation, selling, offering to sell or purchasing of spirits contrary to section 158 and 163 of the Excise Act; or any other indictable offence in respect of which there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe that it forms a pattern of similar or related offences by two or more persons acting in concert, and that such pattern is part of the activities of organized crime.

**Mr. Peters:** You are trying to get rid of the bootleggers in your area.

**Mr. Cullen:** Mr. Speaker, I have copies of the motion, in both official languages, for the benefit of *Hansard*. I heard the comment about bootlegging in my riding. That has never been a problem, although I suggest in earlier days we were known in my area as great rum runners. That activity has been cleaned up owing to very effective and efficient police service.

**An hon. Member:** Did you drink any rum?

**Mr. Cullen:** I was not there at that time to drink any. All my drinks came out of a milk bottle.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down, as it is very difficult to know what these offences are simply by referring to sections, could he say what they are? Those of us who were not participants in the discussion concerning this compromise have no idea what we are agreeing to.

**Mr. Cullen:** Mr. Speaker, I think the point of the right hon. gentleman is valid. I do not wish to labour it, but I did speak to two or three members of his party and also to members of other parties and we went over each and every section. I will be very happy to quickly run down these sections—maybe not all, because they are quite lengthy.

● (1720)

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Otherwise the record will not mean anything.

**Mr. Cullen:** The sections I have referred to deal with treason, intimidating parliament or a legislature, sabotage, forgery of or uttering a forged passport, sedition, hijack-

### Protection of Privacy

ing of aircraft, endangering safety of aircraft in flight and rendering aircraft incapable of flight, taking offensive weapons and explosives on aircraft, breach of duty in relation to explosive substances, causing injury with intent by use of explosives, possessing explosives without lawful excuse, bribery of judicial officers, MPs or MLAs, bribery of peace officers, public officers, etc., frauds upon the government, perjury, unlawful electronic surveillance, unlawful possession of electronic eavesdropping equipment, bookmaking, murder, kidnapping, forcible confinement or abduction, advocating genocide, theft over \$200, robbery, extortion, breaking and entering, having in possession property obtained by crime, theft from the mails, forgery, uttering forged documents, threatening letters and telephone calls, fraud and fraudulently affecting the public market price of stocks, using mails to defraud, corrupt secret commissions, arson, making counterfeit money, possession of counterfeit money and uttering counterfeit money. Those are the sections referred to in the Code.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** What else is there?

**Mr. Cullen:** There are many more. This list, I might say, was gone over very thoroughly. There are quite a few others which we deleted as a result of representations made by the hon. member for St. Paul's and the hon. member for New Westminster.

**Mr. Ron Atkey (St. Paul's):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) is quite correct in suggesting that this amendment has been arrived at in a spirit of compromise. Perhaps Your Honour will forgive me if I gloat a bit when I say that this amendment represents, at long last, an acceptance by this government of the principle that offences must be specifically listed in the act. Until this amendment was brought forward there was no indication from the government that there was any acceptance of that principle. I regard this as an important victory for the establishment of that principle.

A number of members were helpful in the debate on this particular motion in pointing out some technical and legal problems in the original list that was submitted in my motion No. 2. I confess that some of those legal and technical problems were quite justified. In particular, I single out the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) who drew on his great experience as a criminal lawyer in the city of Calgary to point out some very real difficulties.

It was as a result of comments by that hon. member and other hon. members on both sides of the House that I suggested to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) that he and the law officers of the Crown take a serious look at the list of offences and, within the confines of the principle I was attempting to put forward, come up with a list that might attempt to meet their needs and would be an acceptance of the principle. I can report that that was in fact done.

There were a number of offences which I thought should be excluded and the government has been helpful in listening to arguments about the necessity of excluding those offences. I mentioned in particular income tax eva-