

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member started with an argumentative question and now seems to want to follow it with an argument. I think I have to stop it.

Mr. Ouellet: My question is as follows: Does the Prime Minister know that the deal by his minister for sport, in doing away with Loto Canada, a very popular program and a success story in Quebec—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Ouellet:—has been a deal that has pleased only the Parti Québécois, because now there will still be a lottery in Quebec but the word “Canada” will no longer be front and centre; the word “Canada” has been abolished by his minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Shame on you.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I think, in answer to what I guess was intended as a question, I can only say that I think it will be in the interests of federalism in Canada if the hon. member and his colleagues stop fighting the battles of the past and, instead, will join with us in building a federalism for the future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): That is why you are in opposition.

Mr. Crosbie: And will stay there.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

ACID RAIN FALL-OUT—RELATIONS WITH U.S.

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. The environment minister is quoted in yesterday's *Sunday Star* as saying Canada cannot negotiate an agreement with the United States to turn off or reduce acid rain fall-out until after the presidential election.

Is it the policy or the attitude of the Government of Canada that Mr. Carter is a lame-duck president and therefore, they cannot enter into any negotiations with the White House until after January, 1981?

Hon. John A. Fraser (Postmaster General and Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that negotiations between Canada and the United States which are aimed at leading to an agreement are going on now and will continue. All I have said is that it is unrealistic to assume, with the complications of those negotiations from a technical, economic and scientific point of view, that we will be in a position to have the agreement in practically completed form and signed before the next presidential election.

[Mr. Ouellet.]

● (1440)

Mr. Blackburn: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for bailing out the Prime Minister on that one. My supplementary question is to the Minister of the Environment. If Canada is going on its own anyway at the present time, can the minister tell the House what measures his department has taken to control, eliminate or at least reduce acid rain, and what timeframe he has in mind for completion? By way of a specific example, what directive or directives have been sent to the International Nickel Company.

Mr. Fraser: I thank the hon. member for his question. As the hon. member and the House know, the present regime of law to control the emission sources lies with the provinces. As I have said to the House, I do not intend at the moment to change that.

With regard to the company that the hon. member mentioned, the chief executive officer of Inco has been written to by myself, and I have asked for a meeting with him along with representatives of some other companies. That meeting will be arranged as soon as possible.

* * *

NATIONAL UNITY

COMMENTS OF PREMIER OF ALBERTA—FEDERAL ROLE IN EVENT OF “YES” VOTE IN QUEBEC REFERENDUM

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Thunder Bay-Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary and it is to the Prime Minister. It was reported recently that Mr. Lougheed stated that in the event of a Yes vote in the referendum, the negotiations in terms of sovereignty-association with Quebec would be up to the provincial governments to handle.

Does the Prime Minister accept that we really are a nation of ten provinces only and that the federal government would have no role in such negotiations as indicated or implied by the Premier of Alberta.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen that quotation attributed to the Premier of Alberta. If anyone did make that kind of assertion, I naturally would disagree with it.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, that is the second time in about ten days that the Premier Minister has indicated he is not aware of what the Premier of Alberta is saying. Last week, the Premier of Alberta made a very definite statement with regard to oil prices: world prices now, or the oil stays in the ground.

The Prime Minister surprised us for several days by saying he had not seen a transcript or spoken to Mr. Lougheed about it. Has he since called the Premier of Alberta and spoken to him about that statement? If so, what makes him so confident he will make an acceptable deal on oil prices for Canada, in the face of that statement? Was there some kind of arrangement beforehand, or what is all this rhetorical game about?