

*Inquiries of the Ministry*CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF
HEAVY WATER PLANT IN MONTMAGNYMotion No. 258—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and any other documents between any department or Minister of the Government of Quebec, as well as Hydro-Quebec and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources concerning the establishment of a heavy water plant in Montmagny during the period 1965 to 1971.

[Translation]

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, a search of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources files has failed to produce any documents between that department and any department or minister of the government of Quebec as well as Hydro-Quebec concerning the establishment of a heavy water plant in Montmagny during the period 1965 to 1971. I would therefore ask the hon. member for Bellechasse to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

The order is cancelled and the motion is withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the other notices of motion be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Parliamentary Secretary when I can expect an answer to Notice of Motion No. 251 which has been on the Order Paper since September 27, 1971?

[English]

Mr. Jerome: I have made note of that, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

FOREIGN INVESTMENT—DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN
CABINET DOCUMENT AND VERSION PUBLISHED IN
MONTREAL "GAZETTE"—CREATION OF SCREENING
MECHANISM

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister a question. In view of the answer that he gave me yesterday referring to one discrepancy between the cabinet document and the text as published in the *Montreal Gazette* yesterday, has the Acting Prime Minister had an opportunity to check further what was published against his own copy of the document, or has he found that his own copy is missing?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Has he had an opportunity to check it and can he tell me whether he has found any other discrepancies between his copy of the document and what was published in the *Gazette*?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): As I said yesterday, there are some discrepancies between what appeared and the record as disclosed in the cabinet document. That is the statement I have made and I have nothing more to add to it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Why not table it?

Mr. Stanfield: In order to clear up the confusion, which I am sure even the hon. gentleman must recognize exists, can he assure the House that, as reported in the *Gazette*, the cabinet has taken the position in principle that the main policy approach to the question of foreign takeovers would be the creation of a screening process?

Mr. Sharp: The hon. gentleman has been the head of a government and he knows that in the process of reaching a final decision—

Mr. Stanfield: Yes or no.

Mr. Sharp:—many decisions are taken along the way but that no decision is taken on a question until the day that a cabinet minister or the Prime Minister is authorized to make a statement. Up to that time everything is in flux.

Mr. Baldwin: The cabinet in flux.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Hon. members over there seem to be all worked up about something. I take it that the decision in principle has been made. Arising out of this leak of a cabinet document I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether there has been any communication, either formally or informally, on behalf of the government with the United States government or any officials of that government, either on the initiative of Canada or in response to questions with regard to the subject matter of the leak and, if so, what has been said to the U.S. government or its officials?

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Sharp: So far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, there has been no communication in either direction. Certainly we have taken no initiative, and I personally have not been in receipt of any communications from the United States government on this question.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Acting Prime Minister. Since giving his answers yesterday has he had an opportunity to compare the original document, which he spoke about, with the document that was printed in the *Montreal Gazette*?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as soon as I read that document in the *Gazette* it led me to find out whether there was a leak. I confirmed that it was obviously a leak but that it was not a word for word statement of what had appeared in the government document.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Acting Prime Minister has set out one discrepancy and therefore he has made some disclosure—that is obvious—will he now set out very clearly the differences between