

that to be the preferred instrument of the Leader of the New Democratic Party—we thought it would be preferable to have a direct contact between the President and the Prime Minister.

I indicated in the House previously that at this stage we know there is a legal recourse open to Canadian firms. We are encouraging them to pursue that. We are looking at any other instrument which might be available to us, or to the United States, and expect to know the full range of options we might either be able to take or to recommend by the time of those meetings in Venice.

REQUEST THAT REPRESENTATIONS BE MADE TO COMMISSION  
BY U.S. SECRETARY OF ENERGY

**Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, since, as I understand it, the Secretary of Energy in the United States has the authority to pass on recommendations or references to the appropriate commission in that country, will the Government, in this particular instance, ask Mr. Reagan not simply to pass on a letter of the Prime Minister of Canada without comment, but would our Prime Minister ask President Reagan to go to his own Secretary of Energy and ask him to make a reference to the appropriate commission in support of the Canadian cause, which is consistent with what President Reagan promised two years ago in Quebec City?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, if it appears that kind of representation by the Prime Minister to the President with respect to the U.S. Secretary of Energy would be productive, of course we will consider following that advice and following that direction. We are interested in looking at any instrument we can which will lead to the reverse of a decision which is harmful to energy producers in Canada and, in our judgment, is not helpful to relations between Canada and the United States.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

THE CONSTITUTION

REQUEST THAT LEGAL TEXT OF CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD BE  
DEFERRED FOR STUDY BY PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. I would like to revert to the subject raised earlier by the Leader of the Opposition, namely whether the Government intends to submit the legal text of the constitutional accord to a parliamentary committee, for consideration. The Deputy Prime Minister cleverly evaded the issue by saying that he was willing to negotiate with the other political parties. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform him that the inalienable right of Canadians to be consulted has nothing to do with consultations between the parties. I would therefore ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether he is prepared to state in the House in no uncertain

Oral Questions

terms that the text will be referred to a parliamentary committee. Afterwards, we will see whether there is any need for the parties to discuss the conditions under which the committee will operate. For the time being, however, we would like to know whether Canadians will be allowed to exercise their fundamental right to be heard before a committee on the most fundamental legislation of this country, yes or no!

[English]

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, every Legislature, including the House of Commons, will have an opportunity to pass judgment on this. I do not know why the Hon. Member will not accept the traditional way of doing business in the House and that is dealing with the Opposition House Leaders. It is a tradition which has served us well in the past and I would suggest that he submit himself to that in the future.

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

**Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, certainly that is not a clear yes answer. The Government is denying the Canadian public the right to be heard on the Constitution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** I would like to quote for the Deputy Prime Minister what the Prime Minister wrote in 1983 in his book *Where I Stand*:

So let us have this final constitutional forum in Ottawa in the hope that a favourable consensus will be referred back to the House for ultimate resolution.

By so doing the federal parliament will have gone the extra mile to ensure that, to the extent humanly possible, everyone was heard, all opinions were considered,—

Does the Deputy Prime Minister realize that by not agreeing clearly to grant parliamentary committee hearings, he is risking forcing the Prime Minister to change the title of his book from *Where I Stand* to *Where I Stood*?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's allegation is absolutely untrue and does not really—

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Then just say: "Yes, we are going to have one".

**Mr. Mazankowski:**—require any further elaboration. I can tell the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as I said earlier in the House, that we will be prepared to sit down and negotiate with his House Leader and give him the assurance, as well as all other Hon. Members, of an opportunity so that this process can be studied and reviewed to the fullest possible extent. I give him that personal assurance.