

Inquiries of the Ministry

these consultations also include discussions on all modes of transportation—that is, truck, rail and water—with a view to arriving at an over-all transportation plan?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister could advise the house if he would make a statement or bring forward the legislation for first reading before the end of June?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, that is our intention and hope.

WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—TRACING OF
POLLUTION TO SOURCE AT
CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Can he now inform the house of the cause of the pollution of the waters of Placentia and St. Marys Bays. I am prompted to ask this question because of adverse publicity given to the Newfoundland fishery by publications such as *Time* magazine.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, last night I received an oral report from our scientists who are at work in the Placentia Bay area. They inform me that they are now certain that the cause of the pollution is phosphorus, discharged by the chemical plant of the area. The plant has since been shut down. Our scientists are proceeding to carry out further tests.

We are also in contact with the company. It is my understanding that the plant will not open again until 99 per cent or more of the phosphorus that has been going into the water of the area has been eliminated. Meanwhile no phosphorus will be discharged as effluent from the plant.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

A.B.M. SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF
GOVERNMENT POLICY—REPRESENTATIONS
TO U.S.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Since construction of the A.B.M. safeguard system has been begun in the United States and since the Prime Minister in an earlier statement to this house said that Canada's attitude to the system and participation in it

[Mr. Thomas (Moncton).]

would be based on whether it contributed to war or peace, or to the escalation of the arms race, will the Prime Minister in the near future make a statement to this house on the government's attitude toward this system?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not leave the impression that we wanted to participate actively in this system. I indicated that the position we would have to take in judging this system would be based on whether it increases the possibility of nuclear arms escalation or whether it decreases it. We have not reached any conclusion on this yet.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister let the house know what the government's attitude is to this system before the house adjourns for the summer?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the government, I think, would not be very different from the attitude of the opposition. We are not enthusiastic about the system, but this is a defence system being built in another country. Whether it will prevent a nuclear holocaust is a consideration that is in all our minds. But we cannot be pressed into making any rapid decisions about the defence systems of other nations, whether they be the Soviet Union, Japan, China or other countries. We are busy now considering our own defence systems and our own policies for defence.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to assume from the Prime Minister's statement that there has been some modification in the government's attitude as expressed by the Prime Minister during the debate in this house? Was not the government's attitude that it felt it necessary to assess the significance of the measures proposed by the President of the United States and felt obliged to condemn the system if it concluded that the proposed measures taken by the United States are not in the interests of the world peace? Has that attitude changed? Has my right hon. friend decided that this question should be left entirely to the decision of the United States?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. The position is still the same. We realize it is important to make this assessment. What I am saying is that it is not likely that any moral judgment we might enunciate will have a great deal of effect on the United States position. The moral judgment that we can make