

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Béchard: The administration of quotas is the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board, which has to see that all producers receive equal treatment as far as possible with regard to the enforcement of the quota regulations. Any action which is taken by the board is therefore within the terms of its responsibility. I am sure all hon. members would wish the administration of the quota system to be as fair as possible and that no producers be allowed an unfair advantage over others in this respect.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BY FRANCE—SUGGESTED GRANT TO "GREENPEACE III".

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): I rise tonight to speak on a subject of the utmost seriousness. Without attempting to sound too pompous, I believe that if mankind does not soon put an end to nuclear proliferation and the testing of nuclear weapons, all the national problems which we endlessly debate from day to day will pale into insignificance.

Mr. Gleave: Don't you know that Nixon is over there discussing these things?

Mr. Rose: We have witnessed the progress of the SALT talks. Yes, as my hon. friend from Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) reminds me, there is some reason for at least limited satisfaction in the fact that United States President Richard Nixon is currently in the U.S.S.R. and that the leaders of the two countries are attempting to exercise some restraint in the area of nuclear proliferation and initiate some kind of nuclear hiatus. What concerns me tonight is the proposed atmospheric test planned in the South Pacific for mid-June, 1972. France and the People's Republic of China are both nuclear powers and have indulged in testing, but neither of them is a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the national origin of nuclear contamination makes no difference to me or to anybody else; the horrors are identical, regardless of the source of the contamination. Experts on human environment have informed us that the somatic effects of radiation can cause malignancy even at present levels and that genetic alteration may occur generations later. It is clear, therefore, that continued testing must be resisted vigorously and resolutely, not just for the sake of those who happen to be alive in the world today; we must engage in a pact with the yet unborn which will protect our grandchildren from afflictions brought about by the obscenities of irresponsible bomb detonation today.

• (2210)

It is for these reasons—indeed, these are the basic reasons that I entered politics—that I am so persistent in my opposition to nuclear testing. It is why I raised various questions yesterday with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and also with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Why, I ask, should not the government of Canada participate in funding the *Greenpeace III* voyage of protest? Its objective is four-square within Canadian government policy. Besides, many people point out that we are giving away millions of dollars for almost every-

[Mr. Thompson.]

thing else. It seems to me that this would be a very healthy cause, and I regret that the Secretary of State for External Affairs declined my request.

Why, I also ask, should not the Prime Minister wire a message of congratulation and encouragement to *Greenpeace III*, as he did to the Amchitka-bound *Greenpeace II*? As head of our country—whether I support him and his party or not—his support and his prestige of office would carry a tremendous clout in terms of world opinion.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Davis) are planning to attend the Stockholm conference on human environment to be held June 5 to 16. Whether nuclear testing is a major agenda item or not, I do not know; but would it not be ironic if, while the diplomats were discussing the world's environmental transgressors, at the same time the government of France saw fit to explode an atmospheric test in the Pacific? It is my hope and plea that if nuclear testing is not a major agenda item, Canada's delegation will make it so during this particular conference by intransigence, filibustering—anything that is necessary. Then my daughter and the Prime Minister's young son will be able to look forward to growing up in a world free from added nuclear contamination.

Mr. Bruce Howard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian, and particularly as a British Columbian, I am as concerned as the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) over the forthcoming nuclear test scheduled in the Pacific. I agree that it is a deplorable situation and I assure him that the government of Canada and the people of Canada share his concern. A great many private individuals in Canada share the common objective of trying to persuade the French government and any other government to desist from carrying out this kind of nuclear testing.

As the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) said on May 10, the government has made formal representations to the French government expressing its opposition to these nuclear tests—indeed, we oppose tests by any nation—in all environments but particularly in the atmosphere. Our representations called upon the French government to reconsider its plans for a new series of tests in the South Pacific. Representations of this kind are employed by governments to convey their views on matters of great importance only. The question that has been raised is whether direct government support for the Greenpeace foundation or any other private body of citizens is likely to increase the total impact of these representations.

What is striking about the action of the Greenpeace foundation and about the large number of letters which I understand have gone from Canadians to the government of France is that these representations have been made spontaneously as expressions of opinion of individuals who feel strongly enough to make their views known. They have felt so strongly they have been compelled to take some direct action. If the government of Canada were to give its formal endorsement and particularly its financial backing to the Greenpeace foundation, then it might be thought, however unfairly, that this private