

● (1420)

[Translation]

REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION WHY WATER RESOURCES ARE NOT EXCLUDED FROM AGREEMENT

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Canadians want to know what will be the real impact of this trade agreement.

Could the Minister explain why water is not excluded? Why should the Government give the United States unlimited access to our water resources? Will the Minister confirm that Canadian negotiators tried to exclude the sale of water resources from the trade agreement and that at the last minute, because of U.S. pressure, water resources were included?

[English]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this is so silly and so jejune that one hardly knows how to attempt to answer. How can one answer such a silly question as that?

Water is not even the subject of a provision of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. The hon. gentleman can rest easy; no one is attempting to cut off his water, or anyone's water in Canada.

FORTUNE MAGAZINE ARTICLE

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly raised in the House an interview that the Prime Minister gave to *Fortune* magazine in March, 1985. That article states: "Mulroney is so ready for the leap that he is prepared to sell some of his country's abundant fresh water—a shocking thought in Canada . . ."

Mr. Epp (Provencher): That is not a quote.

Mr. Kaplan: It is a quote from the article. This is what *Fortune* stated: ". . . If a proposition makes economic sense and would help relations between the countries, he says", and *Fortune* quotes, "Why not?"

Are we then supposed to believe what the Minister is telling us today, or what the Prime Minister said in 1985?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about Leaders being ready to take the leap, but certainly the hon. gentleman's Leader is not ready to take the jump that he and his colleagues attempted to urge him to take.

Mr. Kaplan: Answer the question.

Mr. Broadbent: Pretty funny.

Mr. Crosbie: Oh, they do not like to hear that. The hon. gentleman is becoming uneasy. They might get the habit in the NDP.

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Hon. Minister could complete his answer.

Mr. Crosbie: With reference to the hon. gentleman's question, yesterday the hon. gentleman referred to *The Wall Street Journal*. That was somewhat more relevant than a magazine article of three years ago. He should bring his reading more up to date in order that he can get more fanciful questions for the House.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

LUBICON LAKE BAND LAND CLAIM—LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, my questions are directed to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs and they relate to his decision to refer the Lubicon Lake Indian Band claim to the courts. The Minister has decided to launch legal proceedings against both the Government of Alberta and the Lubicon Indian Band.

Why is the Minister relinquishing the leadership role that he ought to play in pursuing a negotiated settlement of this outstanding claim? Has he forgotten altogether that he has a constitutional trust obligation to Indian people? Why has he abandoned the other avenues of action that are open to him?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member recognizes a constitutional responsibility. It is for that very reason that the decision was made to ask the court for assistance in settling this entitlement which, as the Hon. Member knows, has gone on since 1940.

When the Government came to office in 1984 it actively became involved in attempting to bring about a negotiated settlement.

The Government of Canada has asked Alberta to provide land quantum, to provide a reserve for the Lubicon people, and the quantum was assessed with the knowledge that we had at that time as to the numbers of people involved.

I met with the chief of the Lubicon Lake Band and his advisers, and asked to have negotiated settlements. Preconditions were put on negotiations with the Lubicon, and Alberta did not respond to the request of Canada to fulfil its constitutional obligations under the 1930 Act. Therefore, to fulfil our responsibility we had to seek the court's assistance in this matter.

● (1425)

PROPOSED MEDIATION PROCESS

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, this certainly must be regarded as a slap in the face to Premier Getty of Alberta. I give Premier Getty full marks and a good