

Deputy Prime Minister assure the House that no agreement will be concluded with the EEC which allows France access to Canadian uranium without that country accepting the full scope of Canadian safeguards on its use?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs advised the House last week that he has had discussions with the commissioner speaking for the EEC, and that quite a number of difficulties had been removed. The negotiation, as I understand it, is with the community as such and the safeguards arrangement would apply to the community, and accordingly to all members of the community.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** This is the important point, Mr. Speaker, because as the minister knows one of the tenets of the Treaty of Rome is a full and absolute commitment to free trade within the community. Will the minister tell the House, assuming France will not accept our safeguards, whether the nations of the EEC have then agreed to abrogate the Treaty of Rome to accommodate the Canadian interests in this regard?

**Mr. MacEachen:** I realize the question by the hon. member is an important one, but at the moment it is a speculative and hypothetical situation to which he is addressing himself. We ought to wait for the final result of the discussions to reach the conclusion the hon. member is suggesting.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

##### EFFECT OF AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC ON QUEBEC-FRANCE AGREEMENT TO DEVELOP COPPER MINES

**Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Yesterday the Quebec government signed a general agreement with the French government about mining in Quebec. Under this agreement, prospecting for copper in northwest Quebec will cost \$240,000. On the other hand, on March 29, 1976 the government of Canada and the Province of Quebec signed a \$28 million agreement for mineral resources development. Would the minister tell the House if the Quebec-France program mentioned yesterday in the agreement might have been realized through the Canada-Quebec agreement under which the federal government gives a 60 per cent contribution?

**Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, just as the hon. member, I have heard about this agreement signed in Paris by the Quebec and French governments about a \$5 million participation in prospecting and mining for the next five years. In fact, according to press reports, since of course I have not seen the text of the official agreement, those works will cover research in geological and geophysical surveys. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it is precisely the type of works covered under the agreement which has been signed with the government of Quebec 18 months ago

#### Oral Questions

and under which I committed the federal government to pay \$17 million over the next five years. I would like to add this, Mr. Speaker: Probably it would have been much more profitable for the Quebec economy and especially for the mining sector had France preferred and judged wiser to buy the surplus copper that we have now in Canada and especially in Quebec and this would have helped create more jobs.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

##### REQUEST FOR TWO DAY DEBATE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Having the high regard I have for him as a parliamentarian who understands parliament, I direct a question to him. It concerns international affairs and the kaleidoscopic changes which have taken place in the Middle East, in the contemptuous way the U.S.S.R. is treating the Helsinki Agreement, and the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to assure fair treatment to dissidents whose only offence is to disagree democratically with what has been done. Would the minister set aside, between now and Christmas, two days of government time so that parliament will have some idea of what is going on other than what it reads in the press and understand at first hand what is taking place. It would also give the government the benefit of the views of other political parties concerning matters which have to do not only with the peace of the world now, but in the years ahead.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the general direction of the right hon. member's suggestion, that it would be an extremely good idea to have an opportunity to debate these international issues. The right hon. member may recall, following a similar suggestion he made in the last session concerning debates on international affairs and questions of national unity, that there was arranged an opportunity to debate the issue of national unity with very good results—otherwise the House would not have had an opportunity to make its views known.

With respect to this particular suggestion, which I think is a good one, I will consult with the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he returns and try to arrange a time for discussion in the House on international affairs. I think it would be an extremely good idea and maybe, in the spirit of constructive co-operation which the right hon. member has shown, we may be able to accelerate other business so that time can be made available.