

*Oral Questions*

The hon. gentleman suggested that the contract was entered into at a time when the government was negotiating additional safeguards. I would remind him that the contract was executed on December 19, 1973, that the government embarked upon a further re-examination of safeguards after the Indian decision or Indian action of May, 1974 to set off a bomb. The government thereafter stipulated there should be tighter safeguards, on December 20, 1974. So the contract was already executed and under way at the time additional safeguards were put in.

I would also point out, as I did to the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, that AECL has an obligation to perform under its contract. In my view, and in the view of the government, AECL should meet its obligation but the government of Canada, acting through its agency, the Atomic Energy Control Board will withhold continuation of the contract, in so far as Canadian component parts are concerned, until they complete the safeguard agreement.

**Mr. Nowlan:** That is what happened to the gas supply—no wonder we are short on gas!

SALE OF CANDU REACTOR TO SOUTH KOREA—ALLEGED STATEMENT BY ENERGY MINISTER SAFEGUARDS CONDITIONS MET—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF SAFEGUARDS

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, I am again quoting from a Toronto paper but not the one the minister mentioned. The *Globe and Mail* of last Wednesday quoted the minister as saying that apparently South Korea had met all Canada's conditions on safeguards on the sale of a Canadian reactor. Is this so, and if it is, will the minister table any documents setting out such conditions?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the actual negotiations of the safeguards arrangement has been done by officials of my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He might be in a position to respond.

**Mr. Brewin:** I do not know whether he heard my question.

**An hon. Member:** He was not listening.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes, I was listening very attentively.

**Mr. Brewin:** The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is reported to have said that all conditions have apparently been met—is this correct? If it is correct, when will we be able to see these conditions? When will they be tabled?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the final stages of negotiation are still under way. We expect it will be possible to conclude the safeguards arrangements with the Republic of Korea.

**Mr. Brewin:** And table them?

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

**DIVORCE ACT**

POSSIBILITY OF AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR MARRIAGE BREAKDOWN AS A CAUSE—SUGGESTED COMMITTEE STUDY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Justice is prompted by the recent report from the Law Reform Commission. Is the minister prepared to bring in legislation affecting the Divorce Act to provide for marriage breakdown as the basic cause for dissolution with consequential relief as to maintenance? This course was advocated by the opposition some time ago and rejected by the Prime Minister who as minister of justice, rigidly opposed this suggestion. Has the Prime Minister become sufficiently liberal now to go along with this proposal?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I shall try to find my way through some of those rather obviously unfounded allegations to what may have been the question. I should like to assure the hon. gentleman that this government continues its very alert stance in attempting to move the law forward to put people in this country in the best possible position. We will be looking at the two reports on this subject from the Law Reform Commission, as well as the other very important reports coming from that commission. We look forward to the appropriate development of legislation therefrom.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, could I pin the minister down, in view of that nebulous reply, and ask if he is prepared to recommend a joint committee of this House and the other place to consider this issue, in light of the fact that the only solid progress in the last half century in divorce reform came out of a report of a similar committee eight years ago and since then the law has stood still?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's earlier question really gainsaid that remark, since the creation of the Law Reform Commission and the encouragement to have a look at divorce and family law is an example of a substantial advance. I have no doubt the appropriate course will be for this government to have a thorough examination of the proposals put before it and then to put legislation before the House.

\* \* \*

**ENERGY**

ALLEGED HIGH RADIOACTIVE LEVELS OF WASTE DUMPS OF ELDORADO NUCLEAR AT PORT HOPE—REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF REPORT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

**Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the fact that well over a month ago a series of apparently substantiated allegations were made about the waste dumps of the Crown corporation Eldorado Nuclear at Port Hope, and in view of the fact that the minister has had a report respecting the veracity of those allegation for over three weeks, does the minister think he is decreasing the concern and worry of residents in the Port Hope area by keeping this report