

*Oral Questions*

the Leader of the New Democratic Party indicated that we would be doing what we had agreed all through the summer through the Minister of Justice—

**Mr. Clark:** Boy, that Ed is a tough bargainer.

**Mr. Trudeau:** —and myself on the first day of the federal-provincial conference in September. We indicated then that we would be prepared to see the provinces have jurisdiction over indirect taxes in the area of resources and interprovincial trade in the area of resources.

I can tell the hon. member that the substance of that was discussed at the meeting and confirmed in my letter, but the kind of amendment we would accept is an amendment which might be phrased—in other words, we would wait to see what they move but it would have to be in substance what we have already offered, plus—

**Mr. Clark:** Have you got a deal, Ed.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Yes, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition seems frustrated at having been left out of a constructive proposal to improve the resolution now before the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

● (1440)

**Mr. Trudeau:** I point out to him, Madam Speaker, that all summer the Minister of Justice has been looking for a deal. At that conference I had been looking for a deal.

**Mr. Clark:** That is not true.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Since the first federal-provincial conference which I chaired in 1968, I have been looking for a deal. There is nothing shameful in accepting a deal which meets the stated requests of several provincial premiers.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McKnight:** Madam Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister that the government leader in the Senate said yesterday there was not a deal. Be that as it may, I wish to quote from page 3566 of *Hansard* dated October 9:

—the amendment my party would propose would confirm provincial ownership of resources, would incorporate a clause with respect to indirect taxation and, finally, would incorporate a concurrent power with federal paramountcy with respect to trade and commerce as it affects the export of non-renewable natural resources, forestry products—

That was said by the NDP member for Kootenay West on October 9. On October 21 and 22 there is a convenient exchange of letters, 12 days after that exact wording appears in *Hansard* from the NDP member. Will the Prime Minister either confirm or deny that there was a deal made regarding the wording of the amendment at the October 1 meeting between himself and the Leader of the New Democratic Party?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, although I think there would be a matter of privilege in not answering that, I think the Leader of the New Democratic Party would not begrudge my telling what happened there. There was talk of the substance. There was no exchange of texts. The first exchange of texts came when I answered the letter a couple of days ago.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION—TELEVISIONING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, I also have a question for the Prime Minister who will be aware of the statement in the infamous August 30 Privy Council memorandum which reads as follows:

A highly contentious measure may best be contained in a committee where it is more readily managed by the House leader and his officers, and where easier and more effective relations can be maintained with the Press Gallery, since relatively few reporters will follow the proceedings.

Now that Parliament is to be gagged and the debate is to be taken out of the House of Commons, is the reason the Prime Minister refused the request made by the Leader of the Opposition for his support to open up the proceedings of the committee to television, so that Canadians from coast to coast can see those proceedings, that he prefers to have these meetings managed and he prefers the sort of manipulation of the press recommended in this Privy Council office document, rather than opening these matters up to the people of Canada, as is being requested by the Leader of the Opposition?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member that the debate has been proceeding in front of television for the past—

**Mr. Clark:** Twenty-four hours.

**Mr. Trudeau:** —three weeks, I would guess.

**Mr. Clark:** Twenty-four hours of debating time.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The Leader of the Opposition shouts “24 hours of debating time”. We offered to have longer hours, and it is his very party which refused to add to the hours.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** You introduced closure.

**Mr. Trudeau:** It could have been much more than 24 hours over a period of some three weeks if his party had accepted that we prolong the sitting hours.

**Mr. Chrétien:** Six to eight and until midnight.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Getting back to the question itself, I have to remind the hon. member that the resolution will, of course, come back to the House—

**Mr. Clark:** One day.

**Mr. Trudeau:** —where it will again be in front of television.

**Mr. Clark:** One day.