

*Oral Questions*

that. I understand that they can change their minds. Before I make a decision I think cabinet will have to make a decision on this and after that I think we will have to meet with the government of Ontario. Because of the reaction on the other side of the House, I think I will have to abandon the Calgary airport too.

PICKERING—INQUIRY WHETHER CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO STUDY KNOWN AS "METROPOLITAN TORONTO AIRPORT REVIEW"

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether in this whole process he has paid the slightest attention to the unanimous vote of the council of the city of Toronto. I would also like to ask him whether he has available to him the study commissioned by the government of Ontario known as the Metropolitan Toronto Airport Review which I understand is strongly and devastatingly against pursuing the project and whether he has taken that into account in his decision?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Hellyer, a former Conservative member—

**An hon. Member:** And a former Liberal.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):**—decided there should be a Pickering airport and made the recommendation to cabinet everybody was in perfect agreement. We took into account not only the resolutions passed by all the bodies mentioned by the hon. member but even instituted a special inquiry in order to have the opinion of the people. So, I think if there is a government which really took into account the reaction of the people it is this government and this minister of transport. At this moment I think I will have to meet, after authorization by cabinet, with the government of Ontario to discuss this problem again, and after that I will tell you what the decision will be.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### HEALTH

SUGGESTED RENEGOTIATION OF MEDICARE AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES

**Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Given yesterday afternoon's statement by the Canadian Medical Association that if the finance minister's policy concerning the financing of medicare were passed the quality of medical services would deteriorate, is the minister now prepared to negotiate without delay with the provinces to reach realistic arrangements on public health financing?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I have before me the statement made by the Canadian Medical Association and I do not see in it anything similar to what the hon. member has just said.

[Mr. Marchand (Minister of Transport).]

**Mr. Grafftey:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Yesterday afternoon, the Canadian Medical Association clearly stated that if the policy of the Minister of Finance for the financing of public health was adopted, medical services would quickly deteriorate. My question is as follows: Is the minister now willing to negotiate with the provinces a realistic agreement for the financing of public health?

**Mr. Lalonde:** Mr. Speaker, it is practically the same question as the one I answered. I will be pleased, however, to send to the hon. member a copy of the release of the Canadian Medical Association.

\* \* \*

● (1140)

[English]

### ENERGY

PROPOSED ENRICHED URANIUM PLANT AT JAMES BAY—ALLEGED CONFLICT ON ADEQUACY OF FEASIBILITY STUDY—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF STUDY

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the fact that on July 3, 1975, the minister said that the feasibility study of the James Bay enriched uranium proposal had not addressed itself to questions he thought to be most important in this regard and that more elaborate studies should be made of this proposal, thus indicating the inadequacy of the study as a basis for a decision, and in view of the fact that yesterday the Prime Minister stated he found the same feasibility study to indicate that the case against the enriched uranium plant was not clearcut and that he was prepared to give serious consideration to it, thus indicating he found the study adequate for government purposes—

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the hon. member a question to put?

**Miss MacDonald:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Given this serious conflict of opinion concerning the feasibility study, would the minister be prepared to table this document immediately so that all members can resolve for themselves which of these two opinions, if either, is in the national interest?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's attempt to interpret the Prime Minister yesterday is wholly without factual basis. The two positions are exactly the same. We feel that the question should be given further study before being rejected out of hand, that we should have the fullest possible information on the project before a final decision is made at the federal level. For this reason, we will be meeting the officials of the province of Quebec for the purpose of discussing a possible additional study so that the questions which the federal government has raised, and which have been on the public record for some time, may be adequately dealt with.