

and I relate it only to estimates, not to legislation—the operation of the order paper, and other matters.

● (1750)

The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore has suggested that governments, when presenting a bill to the House or presenting an estimate, have to produce what he has called the working papers. I think that is perhaps a reasonable suggestion and one this government should consider. But I think the government should consider something else. I think that at the beginning of each parliamentary session a special parliamentary committee should be established, one that would be called the parliamentary committee on program review, to which the documents, namely the program forecast and program review, could be referred. It would be made up of members of this House, and their sole duty would be, not just to examine estimates in the very shallow way they are examined now but to examine the working papers. The members of the public service and of the government would not appear at the committee sitting next to the chairman, but would appear there as witnesses subject to cross-examination, not merely to the polite inquiries which are addressed to them now.

I think we could go one step further and perhaps consider the advisability of bringing back into the committee of the whole House the estimates of the departments. It may be that some are so complex that we could not have them all before the House for all the departments during a session, but perhaps the opposition could be given the choice of departments with which they wanted to deal in a particular year. Those estimates would be brought into this chamber under the light of publicity, and they would be examined in such a way that partisan chairmen—as is the case in some committees—could not exercise their will as I have seen them do.

I think it is important to consider this, and I would ask the government to consider it because there must be a diminution of power in the sense of the government gathering information unto itself and for itself. Otherwise, our system will not function. As the backbenchers of the government party have become the ciphers of power over there, we find ourselves becoming ciphers of lack of knowledge because of the system which has proved itself to be inadequate. Our country would be stronger, our people wiser and our parliament better if some suggestion such as the one of the hon. member were adopted.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. J. A. Jerome (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to intervene for just a moment.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You are not the one who was supposed to do so.

**Mr. Jerome:** I wanted to take exception to one remark made in the speech of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). He suggested that after all the work we have done to set up the committee system under the new rules, and to send to the committees automatically all the estimates in order that a small group of members who want to take the trouble to inform themselves and who are energetic enough to develop some expertise in the area, who have the will and the desire to make that effort, have

### *Protection of Privacy*

the opportunity to get not just one minister at a time, as is the case in the House, but several ministers and indeed officials from several departments who are concerned with the subject matter under review and in this way ensure that the round of questioning gives every questioner several opportunities to run a point into the ground.

The hon. member would rather have the estimates back here in the House, where he has a much larger crowd of people lining up to ask questions and much more difficulty in pinning down a minister and keeping him here until he has come up with a satisfactory answer. What has happened is that the present system has given to energetic members in the ranks opposite an unprecedented opportunity to place a minister in this position before the committee and to question him until they are satisfied. The shocking fact about it is that in almost every instance insufficient work is done by members opposite, despite the extensive research facilities provided to them. This failing in the opposition may be overlooked. What cannot be overlooked is their temerity and gall in trying to lay the blame at the feet of chairmen of committees and accusing them of not being impartial and objective, which adds insult to injury and caused me to rise to my feet in this debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. We have a clock problem. As hon. members can see, the clock to my right shows 6.50, but the clock facing me shows six o'clock. It is now six o'clock.

[*Translation*]

It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m. At six o'clock the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### PROTECTION OF PRIVACY BILL

#### CREATION OF OFFENCES RELATED TO INTERCEPTION OF PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS BY CERTAIN DEVICES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-176, to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and motion No. 20 (Mr. Lang).

**Mr. Ron Atkey (St. Paul's):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, at the commencement of tonight's proceedings with a view to indicating that it is my intention to withdraw motion No. 1, which is to provide a change in the title of the bill. I do this at this time to facilitate the business of the House and to indicate to hon. members the nature of the balance of our work here tonight. I may say, in the course of withdrawing this motion, that I do not in