

Therefore when the minister talks of alternate energy and the development of nuclear power, he is not talking about solving the great energy crisis with which these developing nations are faced. In this regard the minister has introduced a very large red herring. It would have been much better for him to talk frankly and seriously about the lack of research in this country. I have a number of figures, which I will not bore the minister with today, with respect to this matter. These figures indicate the kind of low level of priority that the government is giving the matter. It is really locked into a kind of archaic kind of technology at the moment.

I feel sorry for the minister who has had to defend a very weak case. Sometimes he does it very well, but I felt particularly sorry for him this afternoon. It will only be a brief matter of time before he or his successor comes back to this House and reverses himself. There is no question in my mind that history is not on the side of the minister, and I think he knows that. History is on the side of the angels, on the side of those who increasingly realize that the kind of major sales plan we have got ourselves locked into with our nuclear bag of tricks is now an anachronism, a point of sorry history for us.

The sooner the government comes to its senses and realizes that it is only endangering hundreds of thousands, indeed millions of people by this kind of foolhardy program, and the sooner it presents a policy that promotes sensible and sane alternate energy development, the sooner it will receive the support of all members of the House. At the present time, with respect to its nuclear assistance to India and the other countries mentioned, it is in a most foolhardy position.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before recognizing the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), it is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for London West (Mr. Buchanan), Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon), Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas), Kitchener (Mr. Flynn), London East (Mr. Turner), Lincoln (Mr. Andres), Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Raines), Niagara Falls (Mr. Young), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) and Halton (Mr. Philbrook) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

If the House agrees, I would suggest we follow past practice and print the text of the objection as an appendix to this day's *Votes and Proceedings*. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Nuclear Proliferation

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED GOVERNMENT PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY RESUMING ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lawrence:

That this House condemns the government for increasing the threat posed to mankind by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and in particular by its present negotiations to resume nuclear assistance to India.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we in this party have made it clear that we warmly approve of the opposition motion that condemns the government for increasing the threat of proliferation of nuclear weapons. The motion refers to nuclear assistance to India, but it should not be forgotten that other countries with which Canada has either entered into agreements for sale of nuclear weapons and materials or is discussing such sales include, in addition to India, Pakistan, Korea and the Argentine. Of these countries, three out of four have not subscribed to the non-proliferation treaty which by many is thought to be a highly important part of the whole attempt to secure safeguards.

I want to make my protest, as others have, against the degree and measure of secrecy that we have had in this highly important matter. The minister made a lot out of the fact that he issued the text of the agreements between the Government of Canada and the Government of Korea, and between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Argentine. In addition we have had made available to us extracts from "Safeguards", a document published by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Furthermore, we have had a background paper on nuclear safeguards and Canadian safeguard policy prepared by the Department of External Affairs. But these documents are extremely vague. They fail to reveal the details of the agreements in question; they fail to reveal the real nature of these safeguards. Certainly they do not constitute an adequate disclosure.

There may be some things in this field that cannot be disclosed, but the government has fallen far short of anything in the nature of full disclosure. Indeed, though the minister seems not to understand this, a careful examination of these documents which he has produced and which he has accused us of not reading clearly reveals the dubious efficacy of these safeguards systems in which he apparently puts his reliance.

In addition, the recent conference of states which export nuclear equipment made an attempt to tighten the safeguards so as to prevent the potential diversion of nuclear materials, but the details have been kept effectively secret. We do not know what was discussed. I do not understand why the peoples of the world, in this day and age, are not allowed to know clearly what efforts are being made to prevent the disaster that faces them. The government has failed to refer these agreements to parliament for ratification, notwithstanding the fact that it used to be the policy that when any serious, important international engage-