

Mr. Trudeau: M. Speaker, if that were the proper approach, it would mean that during a period of months, and perhaps more, the RCMP would be put in the dilemma of either opening mail and doing something illegal, or of not opening mail and perhaps failing in its duty to protect the security of the country. It is a very difficult dilemma, and that is the reason the government has taken the position that the bill which we are introducing will only be for an interim period; it will only last until after we have read the report.

● (1652)

It may be the royal commission will instruct us that the police do not need this authority, that Canada, of all democracies, is a country where the police should not have a right to look at the mail in order to protect the security of the country. If this is the position of the opposition, and if they think that will be the position of the royal commission, surely their role is to argue that when the bill comes before the House. We will hear their arguments at that time. Indeed, if they are convincing to themselves, to the government and the country, the bill will not pass. However, if they do not make that demonstration, obviously the bill should pass.

Mr. Alexander: As I stated in my preamble, I deliberately charge the Prime Minister with discrediting the royal commission. Will he answer that?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if this is a charge, I must say I do not feel broken and crumbled. I wish the hon. member would substantiate that charge in some way. I return to the substance of the question of the hon. member and suggest to parliament and the country, as we will when we examine this bill, that if a man's house, which is his castle and which is very sacred, can be broken into by the police under certain conditions with a warrant, and so on, what is so offensive about a man's mail being looked at under certain conditions? Certainly, there is nothing more sacred than my house, or the house of the hon. member for Hamilton West. He knows that in certain circumstances the police can go into his house, his office or through his belongings and search them. He is not shocked about that, but he would be if they went into his house and opened a letter. That does not seem very consequential.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

SUBSIDIES FOR EASTERN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

A few weeks ago the minister signed an agreement with the province of Quebec on industrial infrastructures and I realized that nothing new has been provided for the Gaspé area and eastern Quebec, except stale programs from former governments since 1968. Could the minister explain to the House why the government of Quebec insisted on industrial parks and industrial development in the Montreal, Quebec city and

Oral Questions

Trois-Rivières areas and why it has not scheduled any new initiatives for the Gaspé area and eastern Quebec?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, in our negotiations and in our review of the proposals which have been made to us and also in our counterproposals, the infrastructures needed to support the industrial development, that is to say, the infrastructures for industrial development, were recognized as those which had to be privileged.

Finally, this was also part of the general plan of the previous administration, namely that we were to help establish infrastructures to facilitate the development of industries within these municipalities. As the hon. member doubtless knows, financial assistance has been earmarked for industrial developments within his Gaspé area and also for fishing industrial developments.

* * *

[English]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MCDONALD INQUIRY—EVIDENCE THAT PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE INSPIRED RCMP BREAK-IN

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. It is very similar to the one I asked on Friday and which he refused to answer. He has had the weekend to inform himself of this matter. Will the Solicitor General advise the House whether the allegation is true that it was the Privy Council Office which submitted information to the security service of the RCMP that led to the break-in and theft of PQ records? Can the Solicitor General confirm, whether, in fact, it was the Privy Council office which inspired that activity?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot inform the hon. gentleman at this time. I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Leggatt: In taking the question as notice, will the Solicitor General also provide to the House the evidence which the Privy Council officers relied upon in advising the RCMP security service? Was it rumour, or was it hard evidence which led them to instruct the security service to attack a legally constituted political party in Canada?

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

MCDONALD INQUIRY—AVAILABILITY OF TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to all the arguments about the opening of mail. A letter directed to me was opened the other day. I honour the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for having done so. They said there was nothing of an explosive nature in the letter. As long as we have a police force, for which I have