

*Business of Supply*

not going to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes because it was too expensive. Now it is not; it is today a feasible alternative and, as the Prime Minister and others have said, we face a moral dilemma. Are we to make nuclear technology available to other countries, or are we not, for we know that once we make nuclear technology available to others they can develop nuclear bombs and other nuclear weapons, as we learned to our cost in the case of India? I have heard it suggested that India is making available to countries with which Canada will not deal the by-products of its nuclear program.

Now that nuclear reactors are an alternative to conventional forms of energy, there are 221 nuclear power plants operational or on order in the United States. Twenty six reactors are operating or planned in Canada, and there are 274 reactors operating or planned in 25 other countries. That shows how widespread the use of nuclear power has become. But the frightening thing is that by 1980 all those reactors could produce, as a by-product, more than 40,000 pounds of plutonium, and that plutonium, when extracted from the spent fuel rods, could produce enough fissionable material for more than 2,000 Hiroshima-sized nuclear bombs.

● (1720)

In addition to this dilemma, the Canadian situation is more complicated by the fact that countries are now finding that the CANDU reactor is probably going to be the most effective of all reactors now available on the market. We are in competition with West Germany, but particularly with the United States in the sale of our reactors. At last all the investment and work that have taken place in Canada over the past 25 years in this field seem to be coming to fruition.

The heavy water reactor system is apparently much better than the fuel reinforcement system developed in the United States. Therefore it is only natural that the atomic energy people in this country have been joyfully travelling the world trying to sell our reactors to anybody who wants to buy them.

It is not unusual there has been an enormous sales push on these reactors. Originally the competition was severe. Now it is becoming less tough. Our system is effective and we want to capitalize on it. Therefore we are trying to sell as many reactors as we possibly can.

Since we have developed in Ontario the most highly successful nuclear power plant for the generation of electricity of any place in the world, we can confidently expect that other countries will come to Canada to try to buy a system which at long last seems to be reaching fulfillment.

So here we are and this is the problem. Countries need to have energy. They can no longer depend on the conventional sources and at prices which were traditional for 20 or 25 years. We have a system in Canada that is working well. It can be applied in many countries. However, we know that if we make it available to them, out of that decision can come atomic weapons. What do we do?

I believe the government has put the emphasis on the wrong side of the issue, as suggested by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. It has been concerned about technological development. It has been concerned

[Mr. Gillies.]

about sales, and I would argue that it has been less concerned about the use of these nuclear reactors in a way that could lead to the development of weapons.

I know we insist on bilateral arrangements, the non-proliferation treaty. We put a lot of emphasis on the latter, but we have not insisted that every country which deals with Canada should sign it. The Secretary of State for External Affairs pointed out that he was the only External Affairs minister from any country to attend the Nuclear conference in Europe, so the government must be placing great confidence in it.

It should be pointed out, however, that there are probably more unresolved problems with the non-proliferation treaty at the present time than there are solved ones. There is the question of the great political inequity between the demand for inspection on the part of non-nuclear countries and nuclear countries. Certainly there is the argument that the non-proliferation treaty perpetuates the industrial advantages of the nuclear powers against the non-nuclear powers. Moreover, the non-nuclear powers argue very strenuously that the obligations put on them are greater than those put on the nuclear powers and that this is totally unfair. Of course there is always the fear of the non-nuclear states that no one will protect them if they themselves are not able to develop nuclear weapons.

There is no question in the minds of many that India's decision to go into the area of nuclear development, related to the question of military protection against the situation that might have been developing vis-à-vis Pakistan. Consequently when the government says it is depending on the non-proliferation treaty we should not be confused into thinking that there is really any stability in that treaty at the present time. There is not. There are more unresolved problems in the non-proliferation discussion than there are ones resolved.

The government argues, however, that it will have bilateral arrangements. How strange it is that when we consider the sale of a reactor to Korea we find that the sale is in a sense consummated in terms of the financial arrangements. Indeed, I have been told that lunches are held, with champagne being served, to celebrate the fact that this has taken place, only to discover that the bilateral arrangements have not been worked out and signed. Surely one could expect that before there is any talk of financing or arranging for payments, the safeguard side would be agreed on, but that has not been the case.

It has become clear in this debate that everyone in the House of Commons of Canada is deeply and totally concerned about this problem. We are deeply concerned that the government is putting so much emphasis on the sales side and so little on the safeguard side. I, therefore, concur in what was said by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, and with the Leader of the Opposition, that we need a new approach in dealing with the sale of our nuclear reactors.

As the first step it should be agreed by the government that it will not make a sale of a reactor to any power in the world without first bringing that proposed sale to the parliament of Canada for approval. There would be nothing very unusual about doing so. That now happens to be the situation in the United States Congress. Every sale has to be approved by Congress. Surely when we in this