

*Oral Questions***ENERGY****GOVERNMENT POSITION ON WHETHER MR. JUSTICE BERGER EXCEEDED MANDATE**

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. He indicated earlier that Dr. Brooks has been misquoted by the press. I would like to give the minister a quote of his own to see whether he has been misquoted. This appeared in the Alaska press two days ago. The article quoted the minister as saying that no one invited Mr. Berger to recommend against a pipeline. Would the minister advise the House as to whether he was misquoted? If he was not misquoted, would he advise the House whether it is now the government's position that Mr. Justice Berger has exceeded his mandate in the Berger report?

**Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have lauded the Berger report as a very comprehensive document and indeed a very eloquent statement. I have nothing further to add at this time.

**NATIONAL INSULATION AND TAR SANDS PROGRAMS—  
MINISTER'S PREFERENCE FOR FUNDING**

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to find out, first of all, if the minister made the statement. Second, the minister indicated, when he announced the insulation program in Nova Scotia, that the cost of gaining an extra barrel of oil by saving it is a fraction of the cost of finding and producing the same barrel. I commend the minister for that statement.

In view of the fact if we had a national insulation program that we would save more energy than we can get out of the Mackenzie Delta and it would be at one third of the cost; in view of the fact that the minister has two programs in front of the Treasury Board—one a national insulation program and the other another tar sands program—and in view of what the minister said about conservation, would the minister advise which one of those two programs he wishes to have funded? Would it be the national insulation program or the extra tar sands?

**Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the hon. member that he reread "Energy Strategy for Canada—Policies for Self-Reliance". If he does, he will see the kind of gap we are faced with—the gap between domestic production and foreign imports of oil—that is to say, the problem of reducing a growing dependence on foreign oil which is what the situation will be in 1985 if we do not increase our conservation efforts, bring on a tar sands plan and bring down our resources from the north. We will be in real difficulty.

● (1500)

**Mr. Leggatt:** My final supplementary question is this, Mr. Speaker. On the program for national insulation some prov-  
[Mr. Andras.]

inces have indicated acceptance and some have indicated refusal. Why does the minister not proceed with the national program with the provinces that have accepted and are willing to go on with the program, so that we can make some energy decisions?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**An hon. Member:** Come on, Alastair, up on your feet.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PRIVILEGE****MR. LAMBERT (BELLECHASSE)—ALLEGATION OF BIAS IN  
RADIO-CANADA**

**Mr. Speaker:** Yesterday, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) rose on a question of privilege in connection with a news bulletin issued by a Radio-Canada reporter and reflecting on the political loyalty of the hon. member for Bellechasse.

I have examined most attentively this question of privilege, together with the following motion:

That considering the prejudice to my reputation as the hon. member for Bellechasse, this House request Radio-Canada to set the facts straight as soon as possible.

I have considered a number of precedents, especially that of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) on May 20, 1976. I suggest the two cases are similar. This issue of the objectivity of the media is often discussed in the House following questions of privilege. It would be difficult, however, to claim that the quality of the information spread by the press could warrant a question of privilege.

As I indicated in the decision I rendered on May 20, 1976, we must take into account here a basic right which is as important as parliamentary privileges, namely the right of the freedom of the press which must not be interfered with, except in cases of very serious contempt of Parliament, which is not the case today. The hon. member for Bellechasse certainly entertains an important grievance but, on the basis of our precedents and parliamentary practice, I must regretfully find that this is not a true question of privilege.

\* \* \*

[English]

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE****WEEKLY STATEMENT**

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Postmaster General in his position as deputy House leader. I should like to ask whether he can inform us of the business of the House for the balance of this week. I understand he is prepared to designate two days next week as opposition days. If he could do that, I would be grateful.