

*Inquiries of the Ministry*AMENDMENT OF ACT IN LIGHT OF DECISION IN
LAVELL CASE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a supplementary and a related question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the recent decision at the end of last week in the Lavell case, would the minister give consideration to making immediate appropriate amendments to the Indian Act so that similar occurrences will not take place again?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): All this is a good sign of consultation and participation. I said a long time ago that we were ready to amend the Indian Act in many aspects, but the Indians have said to us that we should not act unilaterally and we are waiting for their advice on what to do about the Indian Act.

* * *

OIL

PROPOSED MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—INFORMATION
ON ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether he is prepared now to give to the House and to the country the vital environmental information which has been withheld with regard to the Mackenzie pipeline proposal, about which I asked the Prime Minister yesterday?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what exactly the hon. member has in mind. On many occasions we informed the House of our progress with respect to studies of the northern environment. We have not completed these studies. We hope to make considerable progress by late 1971, and shall be happy to inform the House at that time.

[English]

Mr. Baldwin: I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs as Acting Prime Minister. Would the hon. gentleman make inquiries and find out which minister is in fact withholding this information?

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): My supplementary question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In light of the conclusion of the report of the Science Council of Canada that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have seriously overstated Canada's research with regard to constructing the Mackenzie Valley pipeline without serious ecological destruction, is the government prepared to table the research on this project and invite the Science Council to undertake an assessment of the extent and value of that research?

Mr. Chrétien: I just said that we have not completed the study yet, so we cannot table something that we do not have in hand right now. We have a lot of information that we are making available—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

HARBOURS

PRINCE RUPERT—APPROVAL OF MAUI ENTERPRISES PROJECT UNDER NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): May I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Has Maui Enterprises Limited, a firm intent upon building harbour development works at Kitson near Prince Rupert, received approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act yet?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act has been given to Maui Enterprises Limited who I understand propose some form of harbour development at Prince Rupert.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Is it to be understood that by giving approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act the federal government endorses that project and will not be involved in such things itself? Perhaps the minister might indicate whether he has a firm commitment from Premier Bennett about a meeting between himself and the premier over this matter?

Mr. Jamieson: My answer to the first part of the question is certainly no. Approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act simply indicates that the proposed structure does not interfere or is not likely to interfere with the provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, that is, in terms of safety or interruption of navigation. It implies absolutely nothing else. For instance, it embodies no permission to occupy land, nor does it mean that the issue has been cleared with other ministries such as the Department of the Environment, and it certainly does not reflect in any sense government approval of the project.

On the other point, I am pleased to advise the hon. member that, while I told him a few days ago that I was meeting with Premier Bennett I thought on July 18, I now find the date has been moved up to July 2.

* * *

POLLUTION

E. B. EDDY PLANT, HULL—RESPONSIBLE MINISTRY OR COMMISSION

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): In the absence of the Prime Minister who just stepped out of the House I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister which ministry or commission has responsibility for dealing with the pollution problems caused by the E. B. Eddy plant in Hull. Is it the Minister of the Environment, is it the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, or is it the National Capital Commission?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): I should think that several of these departments have some responsibility in this field, but I will endeavour to get an answer that will satisfy my hon. friend as to the general areas of responsibility of the various departments.