

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I refer the hon. member to my answer in the House last week. There is no way by which Foothills can act other than under the provisions of a law which is in effect in this country, namely the Railway Act. I have told the House, however, that Foothills has indicated that, as far as compensation is concerned, Foothills is ready to work out compensation arrangements on the basis of the bill introduced by my colleague, Senator Olson, which has not yet been passed by Parliament. Foothills voluntarily agreed to follow the rules proposed in that particular bill. As far as I can see, nothing has happened which is contradictory to what I indicated to the House or what Foothills had indicated publicly before.

As far as giving directions or orders to Foothills is concerned, I have no power under the law to give any such orders.

● (1425)

Mr. Parker: Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister. As I indicated two weeks ago, my constituents watched as riot police occupied their land against their will. I refer to the minister's statement in the House last Friday, when he said that "we have succeeded in obtaining a commitment from the builders that they will settle on the basis of the rules put forward in a bill in the Senate".

I should like to ask the minister the following question. If that is his intention, then why not use clause 75(1) which allows mediation to take place, so that a proper settlement can be reached instead of using the arbitrary figures in the Railway Act of 1919?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lalonde: I have said that my information is to the effect that the company has indicated they are ready to pay compensation on the basis of Senator Olson's bill. I fail to see the problem raised by my hon. friend if the company has agreed to pay compensation on the basis of the bill proposed by Senator Olson.

Mr. Parker: My final supplementary question is also for the minister, Madam Speaker. I should like to remind him that Foothills is expropriating Canadian land so that it can export Canadian gas to Americans for their use. Our people are being subjected to laws which date back to 1919. I have contacted Senator Olson, who gave us the very commitment which the minister gave us in the House, and asked him to negotiate on that basis—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member put his question.

Mr. Parker: Will the minister instruct Senator Olson, who is in charge of the pipeline, to ask Foothills to negotiate on a fair and equitable basis?

Mr. Lalonde: I certainly have no power or authority to instruct any of my colleagues, but I will be very happy to raise the problem which my hon. friend has pointed out with

Oral Questions

Senator Olson. I also understand that my friend has spoken to Senator Olson who has indicated that he had the commitment from Foothills that they would pay compensation on the basis of the bill he had put forward. I will draw to the attention of Senator Olson the question raised by my hon. friend this afternoon, but I am happy to see that he himself has taken the initiative of talking to Senator Olson.

* * *

[Translation]

THE CONSTITUTION

PROPOSED RESOLUTION—REQUEST FOR MEETING WITH PROVINCES PRIOR TO PATRIATION

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. A couple of days ago in the National Assembly, Mr. Ryan appealed to the federal government leader asking him to confine himself to patriation and an amending formula and to meet again with the provinces before sending his address to London. In view of the circumstances and of these objections and considering the wisdom and the interest shown by Mr. Ryan, is the Prime Minister prepared to discuss Mr. Ryan's appeal and to support it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I must regretfully inform the hon. member that I have not heard Mr. Ryan's statement. It is certainly most welcome. I must remind the hon. member that for about the past ten years, I have been proposing such a solution, namely, to patriate the constitution with an amending formula. Several provinces have repeatedly refused and, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Ryan also. That is why we have decided to try another approach. Had the provinces, a few years ago or even this summer, indicated their agreement with this, perhaps our position would differ and the resolution before the House would be different. But the hon. member realizes, I am sure, that Mr. Ryan's proposal would be unacceptable to Mr. Lévesque, to Mr. Peckford and to several other premiers who are purely and simply against patriation unless we are prepared to satisfy their specific demands, which in essence means more power for Quebec, or Newfoundland, or Alberta, or B.C., and that, Madam Speaker, is the crux of the problem. Now the provinces are saying that they would support patriation, but the last ten years have shown us that if we had proposed patriation of the constitution, they would have been against it unless they were granted offshore rights in one case, cultural sovereignty in another, and so on. I remind the hon. member for Joliette that we must be realistic and consider what has happened in the last few years.

Mr. La Salle: I have a supplementary, Madam Speaker. I am sorry that the Prime Minister questioned the good faith of the provinces by adding today that he is convinced they would say no to a simple patriation with an amending formula.