

The dilemma, therefore, boiled down to whether or not, given the existence of the study and Canada's participation in it, given the significantly different points of view, there was a way in which we could properly ensure that the ongoing needs of the present reactors in the Community and the identifiable needs for a little while to come could be met. The resolution flowed basically from the agreement and from the principles agreed upon by the Prime Minister and Chancellor Schmidt in July of last year, that we should undertake to resume supplies of uranium to the Community under all the conditions I mentioned earlier for the period of the INFCE(P) study or for the two years.

...It is estimated there will be the time of the study, plus one year, in which to negotiate a subsequent agreement. In essence, that is the situation. We should be willing, in the case of Europe, to do what I have said....

Veto question

The word "veto" is a regrettable one to be used.... It has been assumed that we should say no, whereas, of course, what was meant, particularly in the case of the EEC and friendly or allied countries, was that we should have the right to say either yes or no.

There is a great deal of difference. If Honourable Members are suggesting that we ought automatically to say no, they are taking the position that no reprocessing ought to be done in any circumstances. I emphasize that, in the view of the Government, such a judgment cannot be made now. So we are suspending that judgment for the period of the study, or for two years, whichever is the shorter. We shall then be in a position to negotiate, I hope, a longer-term agreement, which will not only involve Canada and the EEC but Canada and the whole world community. In the meantime, however, it is not just a question of *carte blanche*. In the first place, the reality of the situation is that very little of the nuclear supplies either presently shipped or likely to be supplied in two to three years will be reprocessed.

...I think the scientific people would tell us, on the basis of the technical competence that exists today, it is likely that only a very minimal amount could be done in two to three years. So in real terms there is no great change. What we have done is obtain an agreement with the Community that no reprocessing will be carried on without prior consultation with Canada.

There will, of course, be some who will make a great deal out of the fact that consultation is not the same as consent. My answer is that we are dealing with friends and allies; we are not dealing with people we would normally suspect....What we have said is: All right; if you agree that before any Canadian material is reprocessed there will be worthwhile consultation with us, we shall resume shipments under certain circumstances and conditions.

There was, of course, another element here that we had to take into account — namely, that there was already a good deal of material in Europe, material that had been shipped many years ago but that was still being used in one form or another and could not, in normal circumstances, be made subject to any retroactive agreement whether a veto was in operation or not. This being the case, what we managed to do