

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, without conceding the premise of the question, I think the question itself raises a problem in that it seems to indicate a misunderstanding on the part of some hon. members of the answers given and the position taken by the government and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. If the right hon. gentleman will refer to the discussion that has taken place, I think he will understand that the purpose of the minister in giving the figure of 200,000 barrels a day was to indicate what the worst situation might be as a result of the *force majeure* clause being invoked, should it be invoked and applied. Obviously, the minister is making this point in order to indicate to Canadians that the situation might be serious. This is a different purpose altogether from the position of the government with regard to these corporations.

It should be quite clear from the government's actions in August, in September and in November that we will do everything within the power of the government of Canada to ensure that the Canadian public interest will be respected. We will use every means to ensure that Canadian control is established over any corporation operating within Canada. We cannot, of course, affect the operations of corporations outside of Canada. I think another example of the government's determination is in the bill which was given third reading just a few days ago—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: May we have order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I really was never good at solving hieroglyphics, but having listened to the right hon. gentleman I ask him this question. Will he get in touch with the combines investigation branch and have this matter looked into? He says that in August, September and November the government paid great attention to this matter. All I can say is that if that is all the government has done, it has not acted on behalf of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lafontaine is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I stood up several times today anxious to ask a supplementary, but I was unable to do so. I am not complaining nor do I blame those who have had a chance to ask their own questions, but I noticed that such supplementaries are sometimes asked as late as ten minutes after the main questions have had a reply. Would it be possible, Mr. Speaker, where supplementaries are concerned, that they be asked immediately after the main questions? I had one I wanted to address but I did not because it was five minutes after the minister had replied to the first question. But on the subject of supplementaries, whether they are asked by government or opposition members, it seems to me that they should be asked right

Protection of Privacy

after the reply is given to the main question. This could give each hon. member the opportunity to ask his question when he wishes to do so. I am raising this point, but with no intention of filing a complaint. I simply wonder whether, under the circumstances, a supplementary asked ten minutes after a reply has been given to the main question would really be a supplementary. Let me add, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow I will want to address a supplementary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

● (1520)

[*English*]

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I am sure our members would agree to this question if it would help to clear up the oil problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is obvious that we have two points of order at the same time. The hon. member has made a representation which I am sure will be noted by all hon. members who ask supplementary questions.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that for the last two days, if not three, the clocks in this chamber have all shown different times. They are still wrong. I suggest that members of the House are entitled to better repair service than that.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY BILL

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

The House resumed, from Tuesday, November 27, consideration of Bill 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; motion No. 2 (Mr. Atkey), motion No. 3 (Mr. Diefenbaker), motion No. 13 (Mr. Lang) and the amendment thereto of Mr. Atkey.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last evening I had just had an opportunity of briefly stating my position on the use of evidence which is obtained illegally. I stated that my basic value judgment was that the public must, at all costs, be assured of the honesty and integrity of the police forces of this country, and that as between the very important value of protecting the public against the commission of crime by criminal elements and the protection of the public against the commission of crime by police, to the extent that it is necessary to make a choice we must make the choice in favour of protecting them against any illegal action by the police. The public must be assured that those who protect society are themselves beyond crime and suspicion of crime.

However, as it appears before us, I think the issue is somewhat narrower than that. I think there is a general