

government the prerogative of granting mercy. In that case the hypothesis which concerns the hon. member would be a real one. But in this case it is not. It is based on a false reading of the law which I am sorry the hon. member remembers incorrectly.

● (1430)

GOVERNMENT INTENTIONS WITH REGARD TO VAILLANCOURT CASE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Is it the intention of the government to immediately bring the case of Mr. Vaillancourt before the cabinet and decide one way or the other on this case?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I believe that with respect to Mr. Vaillancourt the date has been postponed until some time in the fall. Therefore, the cabinet will obviously have to dispose of this case in due course, but not necessarily immediately.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO SALE OF CANDU REACTOR TO SOUTH KOREA IF PLUTONIUM SEPARATOR PURCHASED

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it is somewhat supplementary to the questions raised by the hon. member for Greenwood. Can the minister give a categorical assurance to the people of Canada, and to the House that if South Korea proceeds with its purchase of a plutonium separator Canada will not sell a reactor to South Korea?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the categorical assurance that I can give is that we are seeking safeguards which will prevent the diversion of Canadian materials or the use of Canadian equipment for explosive purposes. The commitment I will give is that we will seek to have that written into an appropriate bilateral agreement.

Mr. Gillies: Do I understand from what the minister is saying that even though South Korea may acquire the capability of producing a nuclear bomb, as it is reported to have been doing by acquiring this equipment that is used for nothing else but translating plutonium into atomic energy for weaponry purposes, that Canada will still go ahead and sell the reactor to South Korea?

Mr. MacEachen: I have explained the situation quite clearly and I do not intend to be drawn into answering a series of hypothetical suppositions put by the hon. member.

Oral Questions

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS TO WHICH REGIONAL PAY DIFFERENTIALS MAY BE EXTENDED

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board and it arises from a letter which the minister was kind enough to send me in the last few days dealing with the matter of regional differentials in pay rates. In that letter, which I will paraphrase rather than quote directly, the minister has indicated quite clearly that the government now believes that there are additional occupational categories to which the principle of regional pay differentials should be applied or extended. I wonder if the minister is now in a position to indicate to the House and to federal government employees what other occupational groups he or the government have in mind with respect to the extension or expansion of this divisive principle?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I fear that this question is somewhat technical. Unfortunately, I cannot answer it directly. However, I shall prepare an answer which I will send to the hon. member and, if necessary, table in the House.

[English]

Mr. Forrestall: Perhaps I will rephrase my question. I appreciate the minister's indication that he will prepare a reply because of the importance of this. Can the minister indicate if it is the intention of the government to pursue the expansion of the principle of regional pay differentials to other categories of civil servants, for example, would the armed forces be included among these categories?

[Translation]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, there is no question of extending that policy to the Canadian Army for the time being. As to other occupational categories, often the regional pay rates are established after negotiations with the unions and I am in no position to anticipate rulings in such cases.

* * *

[English]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF STATEMENT BY MINISTER PRIOR TO AGREEMENT ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest and concern about the implications of the conference on security and co-operation in Europe, can the Secretary of State for External Affairs say whether he would consider making a comprehensive statement to the House or to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence before committing Canada to any part or all of the agreement regarding future security and co-operation in Europe?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to give that question careful consideration. The matter is now being considered by myself and I will take into account the representations made by the hon. member on that point.