Nuclear Exports

based organization, or the rules which we have not yet been privileged to see of the so-called Nuclear Supplier Club of nations which apparently may have some real meat in them, in view of the recent very welcome decision of one of the two bad apples in the nuclear barrel, mainly the decision of the French government to prohibit any future supplies to any nation building a reprocessing plant? My three or four questions to the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has already put three or four questions.

Mr. Lawrence: The minister was having difficulty in finding a pen that works, like everything else around here that does not work. If he has those four questions, may I have an answer?

Mr. Jamieson: I think I can answer, Mr. Speaker. As I recall, the first had to do with Pakistan, the question of why not retroactivity and what is meant by international safeguards. As I answered in the House yesterday, it is clear that the requirements of this new policy certainly do and will apply to the Pakistani situation.

During recent days and weeks I have instructed our officials in Pakistan to enter into what I believe I described yesterday as last stage or last minute negotiations. I can report to the House today that no satisfactory commitment has been achieved in terms of a Pakistani undertaking. Therefore for all practical purposes the nuclear co-operation between Canada and Pakistan is effectively at an end.

We have already indicated, and will continue to do so, that if Pakistan wishes to adhere to both the provisions which were submitted to it previously, and also those which were stated today, we will be glad to resume negotiations and co-operation, but as of the moment the situation is that no further supplies will be made available. In addition, no further assistance from Canada will be provided in terms of dealing with the existing plant in Pakistan.

With regard to retroactivity, the question becomes one of legality in terms of the contracts which are already in place and the like. It was not deemed by the Government of Canada to be in the best interests of the country to abrogate or in any way change contracts which in some instances had been entered into a long time ago with, of course, the exception of the Pakistan one which I referred to, and the Indian one with which hon. members are familiar.

It was generally felt, and I think with some reason, that in terms of our trading reputation, not only in nuclear equipment and the like but also in other matters, that retroactivity would not have been the appropriate course to take. My colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), reminds me of the upgrading of the contracts which we have already achieved in some of the cases referred to by hon. members.

The international safeguards would be the ones to which the international community now subscribes. I do not quarrel if it was the intent of the hon. member's statement that these are to

some degree unsatisfactory or somewhat inadequate. However, as a member of the international community, there is very little that Canada itself can do beyond participating in whatever level of agreement has been reached at any moment in time. We are, of course, most active members of the suppliers' club, the group that was referred to and which is meeting regularly in London. As I indicated in my statement, we are very much in the forefront of urging that the international safeguards be improved and also that these other countries take the steps which Canada has taken.

The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) may very well be right if he is describing it in a world context when he says this is a rather timid step. However, I remind him, and I think he will agree, it also puts Canada many steps in front of every other supplier in the world in terms of the kinds of conditions it places on international sales. I hope I have done some justice to the hon. member's questions.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a couple of questions, particularly in light of the numerous statements we have heard in this House from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and other members of the government concerning the strength, vigour, and rigour of the safeguards we impose. Now we find they were not as rigorous as was imagined and that something more has to be done. Would the minister be prepared to let us have a list of the present potential CANDU customers, with a comparable list showing those which have signed, or not signed, the safeguards convention? I have a couple of other questions I should like to ask.

• (1550)

Mr. Jamieson: I guess it is only natural to proceed in this way but I would hope we could carry on this question and answer period without being unduly argumentative, in the sense that we are all anxious to reach the same objectives. The hon. member talked about the previous regime of 1974. Those of us who spoke about it indicated that it, too, was ahead of the international community in the application of safeguards. We have now gone beyond that. As I said in my statement, we are now closing what was clearly one of the gaps in that program. This was an endeavour to supply some leadership to the international community, members of the suppliers club with whom we are dealing.

The second question had to do with the uranium safeguards. This matter was also raised by the spokesman for the New Democratic Party. We have until the end of the year, as was stated, to conclude an arrangement with Euratom, which is the nuclear agency for the Economic Community, and with Japan and Switzerland. Within Euratom it is possible that bilateral arrangements may take the place of Euratom-Canada arrangements because, to the best of my recollection, there are three countries with which we are dealing. In any event, as things stand at the moment we are still negotiating with Euratom, and considerable progress is being made. We shall not know for another few days whether or not they will be successfully concluded before the end of the year. The same