

invaded the Assaly apartments in Ottawa, that the end justifies the means. Maybe that is a form of harassment and maybe the minister agrees that it is.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any minister of justice who does not believe in justice, who believes that illegality warrants whatever action was taken in that illegality and that the fruits of that illegality are acceptable, is a disgrace to this country—an outright disgrace, and I am ashamed of him, I am ashamed of the actions of some of the police, I am ashamed of an area and I am ashamed of a newspaper like the Brantford *Expositor* that comments favourably on the fact that 137 men in uniform made a raid on a place that contained ten people, that ten arrests were made, seven of them kids under the age to be in that establishment for drinking purposes.

Mr. Speaker, some members of this House were very proud of the 400 arrests made in the province of Quebec. They said it should happen, and were very proud of the fact that they passed legislation that did not allow them the full benefit of the law, that did not allow most of them even to be charged. To my knowledge there were no convictions in any of those arrests. Only seven or eight charges were laid in 700 or so cases. The people of Quebec should look at this; I am thinking particularly of the hon. member for Louis-Hébert.

**Mr. Stanfield:** She is worth looking at.

**Mr. Peters:** Leaving aside all the other problems, if they think they have a problem they should look at the city of Toronto. Their problem was not really that startling. They should look at this, Mr. Speaker, because they agreed to it. They agreed that you waive the law, that the law does not apply to police, that the law does not apply to the state, the law does not become effective; the only thing that becomes effective is justice appearing to be done and that justice should appear to be done where you have proved the case, whether there was any case at all in the first place or whether or not it was even your intention to establish a case.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this subamendment fits into exactly that kind of feeling, where you allow not only the police but any agency to obtain illegal information and you allow a judge to look at that information and make the decision on whether it has any bearing on a conviction that may be obtained. Then it is said that not only will the evidence be available, but that we will accept the tape as material evidence. The minister does not put in any protection to say that the person who obtained that illegal evidence is not excused from having committed a crime, but that he will go to jail for a five-year period. He forgets about the illegality of the collection of the evidence and says that under certain circumstances this evidence will be accepted.

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure other hon. members are, but not all of them are prepared to do something about it. The Liberal member representing the particular person that I spoke about when the problem was brought to his attention said, "Don't bother me about this; I am not interested." Mr. Speaker, some are not, but I am sure most members of parliament are interested in providing law and order for the Canadian people and in seeing not only that the people have law and order but

### *Protection of Privacy*

that law and order is demonstrated in a way that appears to be just for all. This kind of amendment is a disgrace and a continuation of some of the practices of this government over a period of years.

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

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to follow my esteemed colleague, but I should like to say another word or two about the subamendment which is now before us. When this subamendment, now in the name of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), was first proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) I defended its procedural admissibility. But I indicated then, as my colleague the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) has indicated since, that we do not like it at all.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is one of those cases where amongst other things one has to look at the little two- and three-letter words, words like "or" and "and". As we have indicated, we do not approve at all of the effort of the Minister of Justice to re-establish the admissibility of indirect evidence or, as we prefer to call it, evidence illegally obtained. I recognize that the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) did try to improve the effort of the Minister of Justice by adding to the conditions under which such evidence might be admitted.

A significant thing about the amendment of the hon. member for St. Paul's is that he strings together his three conditions by the use of the word "and". In other words, such evidence can be admitted only if it meets all three of the conditions, namely, being relative, being inadmissible only for technical reasons and being the kind of evidence that if it is not to be admitted might seem to cause justice not to be done. All that the Minister of Justice has done, really, is to take out one of those "ands" and put in an "or". Just a little change.

**Mr. Atkey:** It changed the whole thing.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A two-letter word instead of a three-letter word—but the result, if the minister's subamendment carries, is that this kind of evidence can be admitted if the first two conditions are met by themselves or if the third condition is met by itself. It seems to me that putting it that way, the minister is asking for the door to be opened wide. Therefore we are completely opposed to the subamendment moved by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Is the House ready for the question? The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

**Mr. Leggatt:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to see the *Hansard* debates correct, and I am referring to the debates that occurred on November 22, 1973, at page 8067. During the debate I had indicated that there was a report from Quebec that two more lawyers had been bugged and wiretapped. There was an interjection from the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) indicating to the House that this was not by the police. I think the record should show what is correct, because in