

Oral Questions

an export opportunity, they are hollering because they do not want us to take advantage of that opportunity. If they would deal with the issue seriously and permit me to give them a serious answer, I would like to do that. The point I made is very important. Canadians realize there would be thousands of jobs associated with the sale to Rumania. It is also very important that Canadians and the media understand the government will not authorize any licencing agreement to Rumania unless the full safeguards that Canada would insist upon would be put in place by Rumania. It is also important that the hon. lady realize that Rumania is a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

● (1430)

Miss MacDonald: While there may be commercial considerations, there are also very strong moral considerations in this question. Can the minister say if in these discussions that are now taking place, it is the policy of the government to supply Warsaw Pact countries with nuclear facilities, bearing in mind that these countries are normally dominated by the U.S.S.R. which refuse to allow IAEA inspections, even though they may have ratified the NPT? Can he tell the House if Canada has discussed this sale with our NATO allies and what their reaction is to this whole new direction in our nuclear policy?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points which I think the hon. lady does not fully understand.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss MacDonald: I have been briefed and you haven't.

Mr. Gillespie: If you want to debate the issue, why don't you wait because we are going to deal with energy policy this afternoon? Perhaps that would be the time to make your debating point. If you want an answer to the question, I will give you one. I do not think you understand that Rumania is presently installing a nuclear facility. If your fear is that Canada will be providing to Rumania a facility which would enable Rumania or other Communist nations to build the bomb, quite clearly you are working on the wrong assumption. The second point is that we will not authorize such a sale unless there are IAEA inspections with respect to such an installation.

* * *

[Translation]

TRANSPORT**POSSIBILITY OF DREDGING ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AT L'ÎLE D'ORLÉANS**

Mr. Raynald Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Pursuant to numerous representations made to the Minister of Transport by the Chamber of Commerce and the industry of metropolitan Quebec City as well as several other agencies of the Quebec City area, namely the Quebec Urban Community, south shore industrial commissions and hon. members

[Mr. Gillespie.]

from greater Quebec City, concerning dredging of the St. Lawrence northern crossing, I would like to know whether the minister has made a decision with regard to a works program to overhaul and maintain in good repair the channel of the northern crossing at a minimum depth of 41 feet of water. No doubt the minister is aware that this is a priority for the economic development of metropolitan Quebec City. In the affirmative, would he let the House know immediately what his intentions are?

[English]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have had many representations on this question. Indeed, I have spoken with the Quebec members of the House of Commons about it. I will be meeting a delegation from Quebec City and I propose to discuss with them the question of how the cost of additional dredging ought properly to be borne. I indicated earlier that when one particular beneficiary of work like this is clearly identified, it is only reasonable to expect some contribution from that person or corporation. On the other hand, other benefits that may be assessed in terms of development or in terms of shared or diffused benefit may have to be borne by the government or the governments. The province of Quebec recently indicated its interest in seeing this project go ahead. I will be interested also in speaking with the government of the province of Quebec in relation to their possible role in sharing in the proposed work.

* * *

ENERGY**DELAY IN CLEANING UP RADIATION IN HOMES IN ELLIOT LAKE—GOVERNMENT ACTION**

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the revelation that Treasury Board has held up funds for Atomic Energy Control Board to start remedial work on radiation contaminated homes in Elliot Lake, and in view of the minister's commitment as stated in *Hansard* on December 14, 1976 and I quote "we will not delay introducing the clean-up measures while we argue about whose responsibility it is", will the minister now state that he will live up to his commitment and not play fast and loose with the health of residents living in contaminated homes?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines, and Resources): Of course, Mr. Speaker. Let me also make clear to the hon. member that the problem he has identified is not a man-made one. It is a problem related to the natural outcropping. I think he will agree with me that the government of Ontario also shares a responsibility to help in this clean-up.

Mr. Symes: Does the minister agree that the AECB also has some responsibility in not surveying the land at the time the homes were built in a naturally contaminated area? In view of the fact that the health of people is at stake, this is no time for shuffling it off to the Ontario government on a jurisdictional