

Oral Questions

future use, both for Pickering as a secondary airport to Malton and for Mirabel as a complementary airport to Dorval.

PLANNED USE OF MIRABEL

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Madam Speaker, the minister knows that, unfortunately, a lot of the land in the Mirabel area has been rendered almost useless for agricultural purposes by bulldozing and other methods that were necessary when this white elephant was being constructed.

I would ask him, finally, if it is true that the Minister of Communications, his cabinet colleague, is pushing for a three-hour rule, meaning that all flights over three hours would land at Mirabel. That would also mean, Madam Speaker, that people in Quebec City, for example, would have to deplane at Dorval, take a \$40 taxi ride to Mirabel, and lose many hours of travel time in order to get to the United States. Is it true, as well, that the Minister of Communications wants all charters to be transferred from Dorval to Mirabel?

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): That is terrible.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, this is exactly what has been going on for a number of weeks now.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Make a fuss in cabinet.

Mr. Pepin: A number of people, well intentioned and knowledgeable, in many cases, have come out with compromise solutions for what to do with Mirabel. Two have been indicated by my hon. friend. One is to put in Mirabel every route which is more than three hours away from Montreal. Another idea referred to a moment ago by the hon. member is to direct all charter flights to Mirabel and not to Dorval. In my presentation to the cabinet in the coming weeks I will be indicating the difficulties, the advantages and the disadvantages of each of the compromise solutions which have been offered, and the judgment of the cabinet will be exercised on all issues, the extreme ones and the middle of the road ones.

* * *

● (1120)

NUCLEAR ENERGY

EXPORT OF URANIUM MATERIAL TO ARGENTINA

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Does the Canadian government intend to embargo the planned shipment of 3,000 uranium bundles to Argentina on the ground that it is too risky to maintain a program of nuclear co-operation with a militaristic regime which has defied international standards by invading the Falklands and cannot be trusted not to use Canadian materials to make a nuclear bomb, and can the minister state what Canada's reaction will be if Argentina attacks the *Queen Elizabeth II* at sea with 3,000 soldiers aboard?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, as I have stated in this House several times, the government has no intention of imposing export controls of that kind. If we did have export controls as well as import controls, they would likely be of the kind that the previous government adopted after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. They would likely not apply to pre-existing contracts but only to new contracts. We not only have an undertaking from Argentina that Argentina will not use any nuclear technology or material from Canada for non-peaceful purposes but, of course, there will also be inspection of Argentine facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency which will serve as a guarantee of the peaceful use of our nuclear facilities.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South): Madam Speaker, I would like to repeat my question about the reaction of the Canadian government if Argentina attacks the *Queen Elizabeth II* at sea, but my supplementary question is related to the question of exports versus imports and sanctions. I want to know why the government has applied sanctions against Argentina only on the import side, which allows Canada to continue to export nuclear technology to this repressive and dangerous regime, thus weakening the support we should be giving Britain, which is trying to uphold international standards of law and order in this moment of grave crisis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the hon. gentleman's second question was really answered in my first answer. The fact is that we have not imposed export controls, nor has the European community. If we did impose them, they would not be of the kind that would affect existing contracts in any event, because that is not customary with sanctions of this kind.

DEVELOPMENT OF ARGENTINIAN NUCLEAR CAPABILITY

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs who must realize that what we are talking about here is not the export of butter or wheat or even eggs. What we are talking about here is the export of nuclear fissionable materials, and there is a big difference. How far is the Secretary of State for External Affairs prepared to accept that the aggressive and belligerent activities of the Government of Argentina can go, including the building of a plutonium reprocessing plant which could use the plutonium waste from the Candu reactor being built in Argentina by Canada? How far does Argentina have to go before the Government of Canada is prepared to halt its export of nuclear materials?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, I referred previously to the record