

Nuclear Proliferation

whereby the safeguards might be enforced. He seemed prepared to rely on assurances, verbal or otherwise, that he might receive from the countries involved. In the case of India, for example, I find it strange that the hon. gentleman would be prepared to accept an assurance from a country which at the present time, if one examines the domestic situation there, appears in no way to be able to offer the kind of long term assurance which is obviously desirable if the time period involved is to make any sense.

The suggestion of Mr. Kissinger with respect to the establishment of regional fuel centres seems to me to offer an interim means of assuring the kind of workable safeguards which very much concern members of this party and which should very much concern the government. Such a system would remove control from the hands of any single nation state with respect to reprocessing of the spent fuels, a question of great importance when it comes to the development of a weapons device. In addition it would reduce our dependence on individual assurances, assurances which in some cases would in no way be satisfactory. It would also mean the involvement of all states; it would remove the tension related to the intentions of individual states.

Another matter which was hardly touched upon by the Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon was the kind of regional dispute in which we seem all too ready to involve ourselves, for example, that between India and Pakistan.

One does not have to know a great deal about international politics to realize there is a long-standing dispute between India and Pakistan. One has to reflect that by resuming nuclear assistance to India we are encouraging the government of Pakistan to think that either with our assistance, or with the assistance of another supplier, it will be obliged to compete in similar terms with Indian technology which is also capable of producing some kind of explosive device. Has the Secretary of State taken this into account when considering whether he will offer the same kind of package to Pakistan? The establishment of regional centres would at least offer an interim solution in terms of controlling the number of sites, the movement of nuclear materials and possible proliferation.

With respect to the position of India, I should like to remind the Secretary of State for External Affairs that it was his predecessor, the present President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), who said in a release following the Indian detonation:

We cannot be expected to assist and subsidize directly or indirectly a nuclear program which in a key respect undermines the position which Canada has, for a long time, been firmly convinced is best for world peace and security.

I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs: what happened to that perception of responsibility? Does he intend to wait for a similar event to take place, after which he will tell us, wringing his hands, that he did not expect to be let down by the government of India? I might say at this point that I am not more critical of the government of India than I am of other countries which are attracted toward developing a nuclear device. I do not think India is any more wrong than some other countries which have the same end in mind.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

It is interesting that a year ago an organization known as the Gandhi Peace Organization insisted that only the most gullible would believe that the detonation which was effected with those devices was done for a peaceful purpose. When the minister says we have a moral responsibility I am not sure where he has been taking his moral training. It seems that what he is saying to a number of countries, both those which are recipients of nuclear technology and those which are suppliers, can be construed as a green light. Bearing this in mind, the present position of the Canadian government, as reflected in the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs is one not of moral responsibility but of moral irresponsibility.

The minister was specific in chastising previous speakers in the debate for neglecting to say that one of the moral issues at stake here was our responsibility to provide alternate sources of energy to the developing nations. He suggested we must be very concerned that they have alternate energy sources apart from those of a petroleum nature. Indeed, in this respect he quoted the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

● (1740)

With the situation in the world today, I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs is it understandable, or even commendable, if our government is so concerned with guaranteeing lower priced and dependable energy sources for these countries that are hoping to develop domestic industry, that we should saddle these nations with such expensive and often difficult to control power sources? I do not think the Secretary of State for External Affairs has made the case at all with respect to the economies to be gained by this kind of alternate energy technology.

Surely a much more logical approach would be to assist those nations with research into forms of renewable energy which are already available, and there are a number that have not been mentioned. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the actual power that will be supplied to these countries by nuclear reactors, with respect to RAPP 1 which is now operating, it provides in the order of .1 per cent of India's total energy needs. RAPP 2, which the minister has been talking about this afternoon, will provide together with RAPP 1 .25 per cent of the needs of India for energy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member as the time allotted to him has now expired. Unless there is unanimous consent for him to continue I will have to recognize the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I will conclude very quickly, Mr. Speaker, because I know there are other members who wish to speak. Let me just quote the other figures so they are on the record and we will not be at cross purposes in our mathematics. As far as India is concerned, both RAPP 1 and RAPP 2 supply one-quarter of one per cent of India's energy needs. With respect to the KANUPP reactor in Pakistan, .6 per cent; with respect to the one contemplated in Argentina, nine-tenths of one per cent; and with respect to the South Korean reactor, about 1.1 per cent.