

CODE GOVERNING FOREIGN SALES OF NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY  
AND INFORMATION

**Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham):** I am not only talking as an individual member. Obviously, I am trying to elicit information that should be available to the Canadian public on a matter such as this because it seems to me that those who are interested in it have to go to the foreign press or to foreign governmental officials to get this type of information. Here, especially, the House is pretty well united on the general subject of nuclear disarmament, and yet we have to go overseas to obtain that kind of information. For instance, can the minister inform us if at the London meeting, as reported in the *Washington Post* of Tuesday, October 4, agreement was reached for the first time to publish a code governing foreign sales of nuclear technology and nuclear information? If so, why have we not heard this from the minister? When is the code going to be published? When can we have something specific instead of these vague generalities we always get from him?

● (1202)

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** With the greatest of respect, Mr. Speaker, I have been ready ever since the House has been opened to answer any questions which the hon. member might care to pose. This is the first occasion that he or any other member has seen fit to ask this kind of question. It might have been possible to make a statement on motions. There were two days. I am not sure that hon. members then would not have complained that we were taking time away from the throne speech debate. Let's be frank about it. However, that does not detract from the importance of the matter which the hon. member has raised.

First of all, let me answer that specific question. The report that the hon. member has read is basically correct. There is an anticipated published proposal. The drafting of that, of course, is something which has to be done. The contents of it will obviously not be known until the drafting has been completed.

On the broader question, a number of developments have occurred. I am sure the hon. member knows, for example, that within the past two or three weeks the United States has made an arrangement with Japan which significantly alters the total situation with regard to nuclear non-proliferation. We are seeking to find exactly the proper time and the proper occasion on which a statement can be made that will be something other than an invasion. I have no reason in the world to withhold from this House anything by way of a frank assessment of the proposal. In fact, I would welcome some clear declaration from the opposition as to what they themselves would do. Given what they have been talking about with regard to Sudbury, I am very much surprised and doubtful whether I would get that kind of unqualified statement.

*Oral Questions*

**PENITENTIARIES**

POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF FACILITIES AT BURWASH—  
GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. In view of the cutbacks by INCO in Sudbury which will have a very adverse effect on the whole Sudbury district, and the negotiations which have been going on between the Solicitor General's department and the Ontario government for the establishment of a federal correctional institution at Burwash, can the minister say whether he is prepared to move immediately to establish a new federal facility at Burwash and thereby create several hundred new jobs for the Sudbury Basin?

**Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I have of course received representations of this kind from the hon. member on this subject. I wish to report to the House that we have completed our initial negotiations with the province of Ontario and have now set a price for the acquisition of the institution. At the moment, we are determining our own evaluation of the type of upgrading and the cost of that upgrading that would be required to use the institution as a federal correctional facility. I am most interested in the acquisition of the institution. Not only would it provide additional jobs in that area, but it would permit me to implement one of the recommendations of the subcommittee of the House which investigated the penitentiary system last year, a recommendation in connection with the establishment of some specialized institutions in the country. I therefore hope to be in a position to make an announcement in this regard in the very near future.

\* \* \*

**RESOURCES**

REASON FOR FAILURE TO AVERT LAY-OFFS AT INCO IN VIEW OF  
EARLIER STUDIES

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources with regard to this problem at INCO which concerns a number of members of the House of Commons, including yourself, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister for clarification of his position with respect to it. On Friday, the Prime Minister gave the impression that he had just heard of the problems at INCO. His answer is in *Hansard* at page 114. He said that they were informed of this very serious decision yesterday morning. That was last Thursday. Today the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources indicated that the matter had been under study for a period of two years. Assuming that the minister was telling the truth when he answered his question in the House today about studies undertaken with respect to this matter, will the minister now tell us why he did not go to INCO a year ago or perhaps two years ago, to advise them what those studies revealed to see whether this dreadful situation could have been averted? We now see that situation snowballing to Newfoundland and other parts of