

Oral Questions

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Of course, the remark of the hon. member from the Opposition is not relevant to this. My reflection had nothing to do with the presence or absence of the people on the other side. It had to do with the quality of the leadership over there.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES**DRUMHELLER—ALLEGATION MAXIMUM SECURITY INMATES
IN INSTITUTION—GOVERNMENT ACTION**

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. Statements have been made by guards at Drumheller institution that it is a medium security prison with maximum security inmates and minimum security standards. Since the Solicitor General has stated that there are people in maximum security who should be in medium security and vice versa, does he intend to wait until we have an Attica in Canada before he takes his own statements seriously?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have not been advised by anyone that they thought maximum security inmates were at Drumheller, but since the hon. member has brought it to my attention I will check on the facts and see that we do not have maximum security inmates at Drumheller.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**GARRISON DIVERSION—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE CANADA
WILL NOT SACRIFICE ENVIRONMENT**

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it has to do with the Garrison diversion project. In view of the statement appearing in an article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of February 21 in which it was stated that the federal government was prepared to make environmental sacrifices in order to preserve the level of U.S.-Canada relations, could the minister now assure the House that the position of Canada will not be to make any kind of sacrifices in the environmental sense with reference to the Garrison diversion?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): That is certainly not the intention of the government of Canada which has pressed continuously the obligations that have been undertaken by the U.S. under the appropriate international agreement. As the hon. member knows, the question of the Garrison diversion has been put before the International Joint Commission and presently the commission is undertaking an examination of what possible effects might occur as the result of the construction. Of course, the reference to the commission is broad enough to enable it to require an alteration in the structure if environmental damage were demonstrated.

Mr. Whiteway: That is the very point that is of some concern to Manitobans. In view of the fact that the IJC is

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

taking one year to bring in its report and that there are virtually no alterations in the construction plans of the Garrison and the feeling is certainly prevalent in Manitoba that this is an irreversible project, would the minister assure the House that in view of the continuing construction, and therefore the guaranteed environmental damage which is inevitable, not pre-empting the findings of IJC, that whether or not the project is completed to any degree it will not prejudice the position of the federal government with regard to environmental damage caused by the Garrison diversion project?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in our view the mandate of the International Joint Commission is broad enough to permit it to recommend the discontinuance or the deletion of any part of the project, and for that reason of course the project is not irreversible in that sense.

**ANGOLA—REPORTS THAT REPATRIATED SOLDIERS FACE
DEATH—REQUEST FOR REPORT**

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the 4,000 black Angolan soldiers who fled with the South African forces on their withdrawal from Southern Angola and in view of reports that they must be repatriated within a month, has the minister any information as to the truth of reports that many or most would face certain death if they were to return to Marxist Angola?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have information on this point at my fingertips. I will make inquiries and provide any useful information to the hon. member.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROTECTION OF EMBASSIES

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the protection of our embassies abroad totally under the jurisdiction of the country in which they are located and, if so, if Canadians interfere with that jurisdiction are they only charged under the laws of the country or of that embassy?

● (1200)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member might specify a situation. He has really asked the minister for a general interpretation of the law of the country, and I wonder whether the minister wants to try to answer that.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am sorry. I did not understand the question.

Mr. Schellenberger: It has to do with protection of our embassies in other countries. If our embassy—in this case the example is Lebanon—has been interfered with by a Canadian, is that Canadian charged only under the laws of the country in which our embassy is situated?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. I am not attempting to give a legal opinion, but that is my understanding of the situation.