

tion of privilege and has recommended a discretionary privilege in cases which may be similar to the Ziembra case. I would suggest that such a discretionary privilege has been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada, and Mr. Ziembra's solicitors may want to consider that case, in particular, the case of Slavutych and Baker, and determine whether it is applicable to the present situation.

Mr. Gilbert: Will the Minister of Justice translate into legislation the case heard before the Supreme Court, one which is of interest not only for Edward Ziembra but for other Canadians?

Mr. Basford: As the hon. member knows, the Law Reform Commission in its proposed Evidence Code recommended a discretionary form of privilege. I have indicated that the Evidence Code is a matter for consultation with provincial governments and members of the bar associations. This consultative process is almost completed and we shall be discussing this subject further at the forthcoming meeting of provincial attorneys general.

PROPOSAL THAT UNAUTHORIZED WIRETAPPING EVIDENCE BE
INADMISSIBLE

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. It deals with the debate which is to take place on Bill C-51. The purpose of the question is to shorten the time likely to be taken up, particularly on the report stage. The reason I ask this is in reference to the invasion of privacy and the hon. gentleman's amendment with reference to the admissibility of evidence from authorized or unauthorized wiretapping leaving it to the discretion of the judiciary, and the Supreme Court of Canada having laid down in the Wray case the kind of discretion which must be exercised, leaving the rest of the judiciary in Canada effectively without discretion, will the minister now reconsider his position, myself having put that proposition to him, and accept my proposition which would make any evidence derived from unauthorized wiretapping inadmissible, either part of that conversation or the derivative evidence?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): As the hon. member knows, this matter was very thoroughly discussed in the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs and it will be debated again before passage. It would seem to me that the amendment worked out in committee and approved in committee is a very good one and falls within the concept of the recommendation of the Law Reform Commission which studied the whole field of evidence over a long period.

Privilege—Mr. Coates

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

TABLING OF PAPER ON AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY IN NORTH AMERICA

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I am tabling today, in both official languages, a paper on the automobile industry in North America.

* * *

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. COATES—ALLEGED PARTISANSHIP IN CELEBRATION OF DOMINION DAY

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which in my opinion affects all members of the House. Most of my remarks will be directed to you, Sir, as the guardian of our rights as hon. members.

Today we begin what is known as Canada Week, and already questions have been posed to the Acting Prime Minister in relation to some of the functions which are taking place today on the Hill and to others which will be taking place later, most of them on July 1. My concern arose before today's events. The leader of the New Democratic Party today highlighted what can happen when the events are not handled in a proper manner from the point of view of parliament and members of this House.

I should like to stress that Parliament Hill comes under Your Honour's jurisdiction. The events which take place on this hill from time to time are Your Honour's responsibility. If something is going to transpire here, then you must be contacted and approve of what is happening. I would not want any member to think what is happening, at this time and in this way revolves around Your Honour in such a way as to leave the impression in the minds of the public that there is a partisan endeavour on the part of the executive of the government to usurp the responsibilities of all members of parliament to participate in a positive way toward making Canada a greater place than it is at this moment in time and to promote the theme of national unity, which appears to be the objective the government is striving to attain.

● (1510)

As a member of parliament who has been here for some years, I have participated at other times in significant events on Parliament Hill. Without exception, on every one of those occasions, every individual member of parliament, as well as those from the other place, were made aware of what was happening and were asked to participate in a positive way. I remember the Hon. Judy LaMarsh, when she was secretary of state, doing everything she possibly could in 1967 to involve