

responsibility of its political directors, will the minister and the government now have the sense of appropriateness to accede to the requests of the opposition parties for an inquiry into organized crime in this country, because to do otherwise would seem to indicate a curious sense of priorities and a lack of appropriateness under the circumstances?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this was a subject which was thoroughly discussed at the recent federal-provincial meetings of attorneys general. Certainly, from that discussion I drew the conclusion that it would not be appropriate for the Minister of Justice or for the federal government at this time to call such an inquiry. We did issue a joint statement regarding police intelligence and police communications between our government and the various provincial governments.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

QUEBEC INQUIRY INTO BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE
LIBRE—MINISTER'S KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL TO BE
PRESENTED BY FORCE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, the minister gave almost the same answer when we requested an inquiry into the RCMP earlier, but there has been a reversal there as well. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he has been fully briefed on the documentation and other material that the RCMP is prepared to make available into the Quebec inquiry into L'Agence de Presse Libre break-in and whether any process of evaluation or consultation has been set up or initiated between the Solicitor General and his Quebec counterpart following the announcement of the Quebec inquiry, since according to the minister earlier there was none previous to the announcement of the inquiry?

● (1450)

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec commission is in the process of being set up and I, of course, will be represented by counsel on that commission.

* * *

PRIVACY

REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN LEGISLATION ON WIRETAPPING—
POSSIBILITY OF REFERRING LEGISLATION TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Justice relates to the Prime Minister's statement about when the House may recess. The effect of my question would certainly be to shorten Bill C-51. I am not talking about the gun control part of it. I heard the Prime Minister say something about taking a shot at the right hon. member for Prince Albert, but I am sure with his ability he will be able to handle that situation. My question relates to the invasion of privacy. It would seem to me that the police have no business in the homes of law abiding citizens, rooting

Oral Questions

around for information. In relation to unauthorized wiretapping, derivative evidence means evidence outside the conversation would be admissible. Would the minister reconsider his position in light of the statement made by Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Cooper and other members of the Advocacy Society of Toronto, who are benchers? Would the minister repent and tell us now that wiretapping is illegal and if the court gives approval of it they are tacitly agreeing with illegal acts?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would agree totally with the hon. member that unauthorized wiretapping is illegal and surely should carry with it the full sanction and penalties provided for in the law against those who engage in it.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, we have heard that answer many times. We have the Rae case in which evidence was declared admissible because it was relevant, however. Is the minister prepared to take the section dealing with the invasion of privacy and the amendment—which he considered a compromise with other members of the committee within his own party—and put that before the Supreme Court by terms of reference to see if it complies with the terms and conditions of the Bill of Rights which guarantees privacy and freedom in this nation?

Mr. Basford: First, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was proposed by myself and other members of the committee is in my view along the substance of the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, relative to evidence generally. Second, I think I would resist a reference. Obviously, the Supreme Court of Canada and certainly I—at least, as minister—have always endeavoured to keep the number of references to a minimum because that court, like any other, prefers to deal if at all possible with factual situations. Obviously, the amendment and the legislation will have to be certified by officers of the Department of Justice as complying with the Bill of Rights. If someone has a view that such certification is incorrect they would be entitled to take that argument before the court and before the Supreme Court of Canada.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

FAILURE TO EMPLOY WOMEN IN MANAGEMENT POSITIONS—
GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister is about Crown corporations and the proposal to introduce legislation reorganizing them. The recent report of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women noted the deplorable record of almost all Crown corporations respecting women in management positions. This oversight probably does not need legislation but could the Prime Minister suggest to his Cabinet colleagues that the Public Service Commission policy—which I presume is government policy in this regard—would fit very well into the