

Oral Questions

sent to the RCMP in Montreal specifically asking whether the RCMP was responsible for the break-in. I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether or not this particular fact has been brought to the attention of the government by the Minister of Supply and Services, and whether or not, included in the statement to be made by the Solicitor General there will be an explanation as to why the then solicitor general did not investigate, when he in fact received the specific notice by virtue of the telegram, that the RCMP were directly involved in the raid?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): I believe the hon. member is already aware that it is the intention of the Solicitor General to make a statement on this matter following the sentencing that is expected to take place this week or next, and therefore I will draw to the minister's attention the additional information that the hon. member requires and suggests that he includes it in the statement. In the meantime, it is not my intention to add any further comments on this question.

BREAK-IN AT JAMES, LEWIS AND SAMUEL—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): When the Acting Prime Minister is discussing the matter with the Solicitor General—and maybe he will now answer the question—will he ask whether, included in the statement the Solicitor General is going to make in the House with respect to the activity of the RCMP in this particular break-in, will be a statement with respect to the break-in in 1971 into the offices of James, Lewis and Samuel, a publishing company, in which files were also stolen? Can we have an undertaking from the Acting Prime Minister that included in the statement by the Solicitor General on June 9 there will be a statement with respect to that incident as well?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): I will be discussing the statement with the minister and I will ensure, as I am sure it is his intention, that he makes it as comprehensive as possible.

BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—AVAILABILITY OF FORMER MINISTER AT TIME STATEMENT IS MADE

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary question. In view of the actions of the Minister of Supply and Services and the fact that he released a press statement even though a statement was to be made by the Solicitor General—he decided unilaterally to make a statement and leave the country—and in view of the fact that this situation appears to bear strong similarities to an occurrence some two years ago when the Minister of Supply and Services tried to blame his staff for not communicating information to him, I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister would get an undertaking that the Minister of Supply and Services will make a statement in the House and will be available for examination with respect to this very important

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

matter so that we can examine him as well as the Solicitor General at that time?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General is responsible for reporting to the House on these questions, and he will do so in the customary way.

* * *

ENERGY

ALLEGATION BY DR. BROOKS BUREAUCRATIC SLOW MOTION STALLS CONSERVATION PROGRAM—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is here, I would like to put to him a question relating to statements made in the *Toronto Star* by Dr. David Brooks, who is well known to the minister as an expert on energy conservation in the country. Dr. Brooks said that bureaucratic slow motion continues to stall development of fair and effective energy conservation programs for Canada. I wonder if the minister would tell the House very simply whether he accepts that fundamental criticism of Dr. Brooks and whether he intends to change government policy to reach the standards and the sense of urgency that Dr. Brooks' article communicates?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that Dr. Brooks is a very distinguished scientist in the area of energy conservation. I believe he was reflecting the frustrations of those who have been part of a very small group, and a very effective group, which has not been able to move its particular concerns faster than all the other competing claims within a very large department.

I think it is also quite clear that the target which was set by the government in the energy strategy a year ago of reducing the increase in our energy consumption to less than 3.5 per cent—and this is perhaps the sense of frustration he feels—and down to 2 per cent, which I have interpreted as a zero rate of growth per capita by 1985, is a desirable objective which is yet to be fully substantiated as possible by the economists. I think Dr. Brooks would agree with me that it is important, before we adopt a target of that kind, that we are sure of all the implications and whether in fact it is attainable. My own view—and I have stated this before—is that we should be able to approach, if not achieve, a zero rate of growth per capita in energy consumption by 1985.

REASON FOR FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT COMMITMENTS ON CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the minister's own views are obviously irrelevant here because he has just admitted to the House of Commons that the frustration of Dr. Brooks is due to the fact that energy conservation has such a low place on the totem pole of priority in his department that Dr. Brooks had to quit.