

discuss that possibility with representatives of other parties as to whether, within the terms of reference established for the committee, it would be possible to meet. I have no objection whatsoever if it is generally agreed that the committee might perform a useful service.

**Mr. Oberle:** Mr. Speaker, since it is apparent that the companies are experiencing difficulty with financing, and since the bill that was passed by the House deals with that aspect, including the time-frame, in concise terms, is the government presently discussing with the government of the United States the possibility of reopening the pipeline agreement to make certain changes to the timing of the start of construction as well as to the financing formulas? Are there such discussions under way at this time?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the discussions with the United States on the terms of the pipeline agreement, we have no intention of initiating such discussions in order to reopen the terms of the agreement. The hon. member has mentioned that the companies are having difficulties with respect to financing. I met with the president of Foothills earlier this week. In so far as Canadian action and performance are concerned, there are absolutely no obstacles; the Canadian operation is going as quickly as possible. What has to be determined at the present time is up to the Congress of the United States.

**Mr. Oberle:** Mr. Speaker, many of the areas to be traversed by the pipeline have never been subjected to any impact study in terms of the environment or socioeconomic impact, particularly areas in British Columbia and Alberta. It is the intention of the government and the pipeline commissioner to activate one or several of the advisory councils provided for in the bill, in an attempt to get them to fulfil these functions and catch up with the studies that were made in the Yukon and other parts of the pipeline area? Is it the intention to get some of these advisory councils going, as was suggested by some of the interveners before the committee?

● (1132)

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is our intention. It will also be the intention of the agency to consult with the public on the social and economic terms which have been tentatively established for carrying out the project.

#### NORTHERN PIPELINE—PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question in direct line with the last comments of the House leader about consultation with the public. More than a week has gone by since the preliminary date for the submission of views on the environmental and socioeconomic impact studies asked for by the commissioner. Has the minister been in touch with the commissioner to set up a program of public hearings? If so, will the schedule be made known to all members of the House so that they can be there and hear what the public has to say about this matter?

#### Oral Questions

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received from the commissioner any schedule of meetings, but I will raise the matter with him.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** In that case, will the House leader given an undertaking that when he does get the schedule arranged with the commissioner, he will communicate with the other House leaders even if the House is not in session so they may apprise members of the various parties about this particular schedule?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues are available during the recess, I will be happy to consult with them.

\* \* \*

#### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

##### CANADA'S PROPOSALS FOR SETTLEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN PROBLEMS

**Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, whom I welcome back to the House after his trip abroad. I have two questions concerning Canada's involvement in southern Africa. The first concerns Namibia. Canada put forward, on behalf of the five western nations, a package of proposals for a UN supervised transition for the future independence of Namibia. That package ran into trouble with the leaders of SWAPO and was followed by South Africa's raid on guerrilla units.

In light of the recent meetings in London, can the minister indicate the present status of that package, bearing in mind his previous remarks that it was not negotiable, and can he specifically tell the House what Canada's continuing role will be in the obtaining of independence for Namibia?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the package to which the hon. member refers continues to be on the table. As the House knows, it has been accepted by South Africa. While not rejecting the package outright, SWAPO indicated some reservations concerning it. There was a period of several weeks during which no contact occurred—official contact, in any event—between the five western countries and SWAPO.

The hon. member made reference to meetings in London. Perhaps he was alluding to the meetings in Paris. In any event, we met in Paris last week. The decision was taken there that the Western Five countries would resume the initiative and would seek means of talking with SWAPO once again about keeping the initiative going and keeping the progress going. To date, those meetings have not taken place because a number of steps have to be taken with regard to consulting South Africa and also some frontline states. I am shortening, here, a very complex subject.