

more people than to give coverage over one single-language network.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

NEW EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

TIMING OF FUND EXPENDITURES

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment. The economic statement of the Minister of Finance claimed that the latest job-creation program called NEED would create, and I quote, "jobs for 60,000 individuals over a period of 18 months." This time frame is crucial, given the fact that we have over one and a half million people unemployed, and given the fact that some 55,000 people, projected to reach up to 90,000, are exhausting their unemployment insurance benefits each month. Will the Minister confirm that in fact these funds will be spent over a period of two and a half to three years?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I would like to explain to the Hon. Member that the job-creation programs initiated in this fiscal year, which only has three or four months to go before the April deadline, will operate in the next fiscal year. However, because they are operating on a 12-month basis they will overlap. The entire job-creation program will run through three fiscal years, but in fact will be operative for two and a half years. I think if the Hon. Member would look at the simple calculus based upon that example, he would correct his statement.

EXPENDITURES IN QUEBEC

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Madam Speaker, the prospect that Canadians are facing, to use the example of Quebec, is this: during this fiscal year there will be something like \$10.5 million spent on employment in a Province which now has 23 per cent of its working population on welfare or unemployment insurance. I wonder if the Minister could confirm these statistics which we are receiving from the Provinces, that for Canada as a whole, in this fiscal year, they will be spending some \$30 million, in the next fiscal year, \$320 million, and in the third fiscal year as much as \$150 million? And why, Madam Speaker, is the Minister saying one thing to the public through the economic statement of the Minister of Finance, and another thing to the Provinces in private?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, again I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that his figures are dead wrong when it comes to how much is being allocated for job creation, because in the Province of Quebec alone, if one totals up what is being spent on the NEED Program, as well as the other job-creation programs, it would come closer to \$100 million in this period

Oral Questions

of time, not the \$10 million he talks about. I think, Madam Speaker, before we get down to answering his question, he should do his sums a little better, and then we can get down to a fair exchange.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES STORAGE OF RADIOACTIVE WASTES IN NIAGARA AREA

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the minister responsible for the protection of the Canadian environment. Despite the fact that the Niagara area is one of the most heavily chemically-contaminated areas on the whole of this continent, it is proposed by the United States authorities that they establish a 1,000-acre dumping ground for radioactive waste, waste coming from several of the American states. This site is located within five miles of the Niagara River and there are already some 16,000 tonnes of radioactive waste stored since World War II. This should not be allowed to happen.

People's groups on both sides of the river are looking to the Canadian Government as their last hope. What action, Mr. Minister, is your Department proposing to take, or the Government of Canada, to halt this proposal which would endanger the lives of over four million Canadians who use the Niagara-Lake Ontario waterway as a source for drinking water?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, this is indeed a very serious question. The Hon. Member for Niagara Falls has already been very vigorous in his representations to me on exactly the same point. As a result of these representations, we have opened discussions with the American authorities to try to make sure they are entirely conscious of the kinds of concerns which the Hon. Member has expressed.

RADIATION LEAKAGE FROM DUMPS

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Madam Speaker, as one of the Minister's colleagues mentioned earlier, the time is now for action, not talk. The Minister already knows there is a radiation leak from the contamination dumps already there, which is leaking into the Niagara River. With a situation like that, scientific authorities say there is no safe level for radiation. In light of the facts which his Department has in its files, what action, really, does the Minister propose to take, or is this one of the trade-off areas which he has said himself are necessary in the environmental world?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, I am not sure what the Hon. Member is referring to when he talks of "trade offs". We are not talking about trade offs in this regard. We are taking the kind of action I thought he was recommending in his original question. The action required is on the part of the American authorities. It is