

*Oral Questions*

ministers said to the judges and when and how, rather than what the ministers said between themselves.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

ALLEGATIONS OF INTERFERENCE BY JUDGE MACKAY—  
POSSIBILITY OF PUNISHMENT FOR MINISTERS WHO  
APPROACHED JUDGES

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Let us get down to the nitty gritty. It has been stated by the law societies of both Ontario and Quebec that leaving aside the grievance which might come into play with respect to judges, a cardinal rule has been broken by the ministers who so approached them. Would the Prime Minister now advise this House what punishment he envisages for those ministers who broke those rules, and when can we expect an announcement in that regard?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The point I was making to the hon. member in my first answer—and the second one follows it—is that ministers by speaking between themselves have not broken any rules of which I know. If there are any rules broken—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** It must happen frequently that members of the cabinet discuss—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Clark:** Why are they afraid to reveal it?

**Mr. Trudeau:** That is my answer, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Alexander:** It's not a very good one.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Alexander:** You have broken a cardinal rule.

**An hon. Member:** Name the cardinal.

**Mr. Fairweather:** I can name the cardinal. He is with the Queen, Harold Wilson and the Pope—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Fairweather:**—who seem to be intervening in Canada's constitutional evolution.

ALLEGATIONS OF INTERFERENCE BY JUDGE MACKAY—  
SUGGESTED REFRESHER COURSE IN ETHICS FOR MINISTERS

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, pending the chief justice's report—and whether or not it is secret is apparently up to the cardinal—will the Prime Minister convene a refresher course in legal and ministerial ethics for his cabinet colleagues based, I suggest, on a most excellent speech by Professor Lederman—that should have had much wider publicity than it did—made to the judges' meeting last week in Toronto?

[Mr. Trudeau,]

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this question is addressed to the gallery rather than to me.

\* \* \*

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—SAFEGUARDS AGAINST NUCLEAR EXPLOSION WHEN  
NUCLEAR AID IS RESUMED

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the hope that he will be better informed than the Prime Minister as to any accord or agreement reached between India and Canada over resumption of nuclear aid.

Will the minister tell us explicitly what arrangements were worked out in New Delhi by the Prime Minister's political adviser, and if any agreement was arrived at which would ensure that India will refrain from the detonation of a nuclear device during the lifetime of its reactors and not just for the 15 month period in which the Rajasthan reactor is to be completed, as initial reports seem to indicate?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am not any better informed than the Prime Minister on this subject, but I can tell the hon. member that the negotiating team in New Delhi, which was headed by Michel Dupuy, the Assistant Under-secretary of State for External Affairs, did reach some understandings with the negotiating team on the Indian side. These understandings are subject to approval by myself and by the cabinet, and until consideration is given to the report which will be made to me, I do not think it would be very relevant or useful to give a report of understandings which have not yet been approved by the government and which may not be implemented.

● (1440)

ADHERENCE TO NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY AS  
PRECONDITION TO GRANTING NUCLEAR AID—POSSIBILITY OF  
DOUBLE STANDARD

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister to clarify his government's decision with regard to ratification of the NPT as a precondition to the export of nuclear aid as a result of two statements made by his parliamentary secretary last night on the adjournment debate as follows:

NPT adherence is not an absolute precondition to nuclear trade on commercial terms with other countries.

Later the hon. lady said:

NPT adherence is a precondition for extending bilateral government development assistance resources in the nuclear field.

Mr. Speaker, am I to take it from this that when nuclear exports are thought to be commercially profitable, Canada will peddle its nuclear technology throughout the world regardless of the moral and political consequences of such sales? If not, why the double standard?