

*Atomic Energy*

information concerning the financial transaction involved in the sale of plutonium by Canada to France. In a like manner, when there is to be an agreement for the exchange of technical scientific information with an accompanying financial transaction, apparently we are not to receive any information concerning how much is involved.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that this is an undesirable development in respect of which the battle will have to be joined some time soon. The government can have no excuse, unless security or the defence of the state is involved, for withholding mundane information like the amount of money that is to change hands.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, the minister's statement is causing confusion rather than making matters clear.

First, he says, towards the end of his statement:

In the light of these developments abroad, I am sure the house will recognize the significance of French interest in the Canadian nuclear power system, and of the agreement to extend appreciably the co-operation between Canada and France in the field of nuclear power.

As the spokesman for the official opposition party pointed out a while ago, what do we get from France in return for the information we are giving her on atomic energy?

At the outset of his statement the minister states and I quote:

The first heavy water for the early Canadian reactor experiments was brought to Canada by French scientists.

The fact remains that France never used such a method and the statement says that the French had primarily concentrated on the development of the gas-cooled type system, which costs twice as much as the Canadian cooling system. In fact, it says here:

—a system that is not in the Canadian program.

—as regards the French system.

Then instead of reading us a five-page document to tell us that there are unilateral exchanges, that we are going to supply information being unaware of what we will receive, the minister should consult his experts and tell us what France is offering us in return for what we have to offer her. We are going to help her. Mind you, I have no objection to helping France, far from it—however, we ought to know what we will get in return. Can French technicians supply us with better information than that we have had up to now, in Canada, in the electronuclear field, or

[Mr. Schreyer.]

shall we simply be satisfied to supply information, even if we get nothing in return. It would be advisable, in my opinion, for the minister to consult his experts, as I said earlier, and to make a clearer, more specific, more intelligible statement for the benefit of the house. Mr. Speaker, rhetorical statements, are all very well, but they do not help to get things done.

If there are any exchanges, what are they? I think that Canada has the right to know.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[English]

**HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES****PROVISION FOR LABELLING OF POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES**

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey)** moved the first reading of Bill No. C-118, concerning the labelling of hazardous household products.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Explain.

**Mr. Mather:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is simply to require the labelling of hazardous products, particularly detergents, as being potentially dangerous to the health of those who may accidentally ingest or inhale them, notably children and housewives. Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

**NATIONAL TRADE MARK AND TRUE LABELLING ACT****AMENDMENTS RESPECTING LABELLING OF CLOTHING FIBRES**

**Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich)** moved the first reading of Bill No. C-119, to amend the National Trade Mark and True Labelling Act.

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Anderson:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require garment manufacturers to clearly label their products with the true fibre content. This is important for two reasons, first, in respect of dry cleaning. Unless garments are properly marked dry cleaners do not know how they should be handled having regard to fibre content. The second reason is inflammability. It is a scandal that in Canada children's garments are being sold which are inflammable when there is no indication of this on the labels.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.