

it has been established today in the House that the government's labours have only produced a still-born sparrow.

As stated by the previous speakers, the minister's statement demonstrates that the government is afraid of tackling the problem of foreign financial control, that it has no solution to put forward or that it is afraid of doing so because that solution is quite disappointing.

Before today, the government was satisfied to study in cabinet the problem of foreign control. Accordingly to this statement, we will be able to discuss foreign control in this House, because we are only allowed to study the problem. The statement was divided into four parts.

The objective is to set up a takeover review process and also to establish an agency within which a secretary appointed by the governor in council will play a major role. We are not even told whether this secretary, who will be appointed and whose role will be most important, will be a Canadian.

The statement also provides so called guarantees to those who buy Canadian companies or to investors, who will be heard. Indeed, it provides guarantees to investors and to those who will be planning to buy Canadian companies in so far as they will have the opportunity of being heard by the minister or by the secretary.

Investors will also be compelled to keep the minister informed of their transaction projects. That is all we shall be able to do; this will be another kind of board without any power, another bill without any teeth in it, another legislation which will not mean anything but which will enable liberal candidates to indulge in another snare and delusion, to make a lot of fuss about it and which will also give the liberal party the funds it could not get before because today a foreign investor can sleep like a log.

Mr. Speaker, no solution has been presented that could put Canadians in a position to regain control over the economy. Foreigners have taken over our economy as a result of credits that were granted to Canada by foreign banks.

Nowhere in the proposed bill is there a reference to the part that the Bank of Canada could play to enable the Canadian economy to develop on its own, thanks to Canadian instead of foreign credits.

Mr. Speaker, I do not blame foreign investors but only our governments of the past which had no financial policy and which would beg foreign and international bankers on their knees for money to invest in our country for the purpose of developing Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Social Credit Party will certainly have the opportunity of examining this matter again in the House, and their policy respecting control over foreign ownership is very well known both by the government and the people of Canada.

There is wealth in Canada, there is a potential, there are engineers and technicians; but there are also the Bank of Canada and the federal government which will not allow the Canadian credit to serve the Canadian economy.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: It being after five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business—

#### Protection of Privacy Bill

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that we dispense with private members' business and call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

At 5.50 p.m. the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### PROTECTION OF PRIVACY BILL

##### AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE, CROWN LIABILITY ACT AND OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-6, to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes available to me before five o'clock when we debated this bill I tried to make several points. First of all, I said that in recent years there has been a good deal more wiretapping and electronic surveillance by the police than previously, and second, that until very recently government spokesmen were, to say the least, loth to admit that such activities took place. I suppose they and the police thought that if they did not admit that such activities took place, the public would not know they were taking place.

I said just before five o'clock that I would not put on the record proof of what I had been saying. However, let me put on the record of *Hansard* the reply to a question which I put to the government in 1963. Hon. members can find the question and the answer on page 3903 of *Hansard* for October 23, 1963. The question was as follows:

Has any department of the government (including the RCMP) equipment which is used for the tapping of telephone wires and, if so (a) what departments (b) for what purpose, and under what authority is this equipment used?

The answer given by the then secretary of state, Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, was as follows:

The policy of this government, and of previous governments, has been to decline to answer questions of this order as being contrary to the public interest, and there is no intention of changing this policy.

• (2010)

This policy is illustrated by the answer made to a similar question on February 26, 1962. See debates of the House of Commons, 1962 session, volume II at page 1245.