## Oral Questions

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, that seems to me like an absurd question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: For an absurd minister.

**Mr.** Gillespie: Surely, a moment's reflection would have convinced the hon. member that in this country we are too often involved in duplicating the work of the provinces.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: Surely, the time has come to support our arrangements so that the federal government can do certain things and we in the federal government can use the useful work done by the provinces.

Mr. Clark: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since we now have an expression of the view of the government that they want to use the work of a provincial agency, may we have an undertaking from the minister that the government is prepared to consider the reports of the Porter inquiry and act upon its recommendations, consider them with the same seriousness and act upon their recommendations in the same way, as they would a royal commission or any other agency established under their own jurisdiction.

**Mr.** Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I think I have made that clear all along. We are looking forward to the work of the Porter commission.

Mr. Fraser: Will you follow its recommendations?

Mr. Gillespie: Of course, we would want to use the information provided.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—AMOUNT OF LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It arises from reports that Ross Campbell, chairman of AECL, has finally signed a renegotiated contract with Argentina and that the anticipated loss is now between \$23 million and \$40 million. In view of the fact that AECL officials have given themselves a margin of error of a mere 100 per cent in counting up their losses, will the minister tell the House how he is so sure that these losses will not exceed \$40 million, \$50 million or \$60 million? What is the upper figure?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. lady has already indicated what the upper figure is. That, if I understand it, is \$40 million.

**An hon. Member:** Plus 100 per cent. [Mr. Clark.]

Mr. Gillespie: I do not know what further information the hon. member wants. All I can tell her is that I think Mr. Campbell was able to negotiate a good deal for Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh. oh!

An hon. Member: I would hate to see a bad deal.

Mr. Gillespie: Any time the opposition can show me how they can save \$75 million I would like to hear it.

Mr. Fairweather: April Fool's Day is not here yet.

Miss MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is that the \$40 million loss which the minister is looking upon as a benefit he is liable to turn over to the provinces in due course along with the other matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

POSSIBILITY OF WITHDRAWING FROM SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTORS

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): In view of the fact that over the years the Canadian people have been told by this government that we are in fact doing the third world a service by letting them have our reactors, will the minister tell the House whether the sordid and inept business practices of AECL have rubbed so much of the gloss off those pious sentiments as to induce the government to leave the nuclear reactor export business for good?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): No, Mr. Speaker, but I acknowledge that there were mistakes made. There is no question that mistakes were made. But I think we should recognize that while mistakes were made on the first one, we learned something.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: Let me put it in these terms. I think we learned enough that we are going to more than compensate for the loss of the first by the profits on the second.

## **EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

RECOGNITION BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITY OF UNITED STATES 200-MILE COASTAL ZONE—EFFECT ON CANADIAN CLAIM TO GEORGES BANK

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. On February 16 it is reported that the United States and the European Economic Community signed an agreement which recognizes the new U.S. 200-mile coastal zone. That recognition, as I understand it, was unconditional. Can the minister advise what effect this will have on Canada's long-term claim to the Georges Bank?