

safety of mankind is the primary consideration. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he suggests that we ought to stop all sales of CANDU reactors and nuclear technology until such time as the government has brought down a clear cut policy setting out the terms and conditions under which we will export this very dangerous nuclear know-how and these nuclear reactors.

I should like to see the government formulate a fourfold program with respect to the safeguards it will impose before nuclear reactors and fissionable material can be sold to other countries.

First of all, there should be no sales in world trouble spots, certainly not in the Middle East, certainly not in the Southeast Asia area, certainly not in any areas where it is perfectly clear war could break out on the slightest provocation. We should avoid these areas.

● (1710)

Second, there should be no sales where there is an unstable political situation. The government to which we sell a nuclear reactor today may not be in office two years or five years from now. The danger is not just that such government may decide on its own to make a nuclear bomb; the danger is also that it may make plutonium available to terrorist groups for activities in other countries. Eleven pounds of plutonium will make a bomb with the explosive equivalent of 20,000 tons of dynamite. You can put 11 pounds of plutonium in a suitcase. We are playing with dangerous weapons. We are playing with the survival of mankind. We ought to make sure that no fissionable material or reactor is sold to any military dictatorship, to any of the little sawdust caesars who are endangering the peace of mankind.

Third, I suggest that in order to be a recipient of a CANDU reactor and uranium, a country ought to have signed and ratified the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. A country which refuses to do this is saying openly that it intends eventually to become a member of the nuclear club.

Fourth, we ought to insist on a bilateral treaty which will provide for inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and stipulate that Canada will be the sole supplier and owner of the uranium rods which are provided, and that the spent rods will be recovered by Canada to prevent plutonium from being diverted for the purpose of making explosive devices. If any country says these conditions are too severe, I say that country wants to use the plutonium for other than peaceful purposes. If we want to give developing countries the possibilities for nuclear energy, but there is no reason why such countries must own and control the uranium rods. They will get the benefit of the power, but Canada must retain sole control of the rods. Canada should also retain control of the plutonium, the by-product of the reactor.

Some will say that if we impose such severe restrictions our customers will go elsewhere. That may be true, but every country has to live with its own conscience. If some nations cannot get reactors from us and turn to other countries unwise enough to sell to them, without investigating properly what is to be done with them; that is their responsibility. We, in this parliament, particularly the government and more particularly the Secretary of State

Business of Supply

for External Affairs, have the responsibility of making sure we do not join the merchants of death club, that we do not have on our consciences for decades to come any part we may have played in provoking a nuclear war in some part of the world. We are on the verge of a precipice. It will not take much to push the world over the edge, into the abyss. I say that this House, this government, should insist on our stopping this madness before it is too late.

Mr. Gillies: Madam Chairman, may I congratulate the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands for giving an outstanding summary of some of the more serious problems facing the world.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to discuss some aspects of our external affairs in a systematic and significant way. I was interested to hear what the hon. member for York West had to say about the work of the Commonwealth. He gave a fine report, although I would not agree entirely with it, even though I know he came to his conclusions after attending the Commonwealth meeting. I suggest that Canadian prestige in the world is declining, something which I, as a Canadian, along with other Canadians, regret. What is the reason for this decline? Fundamentally it seems to me that the reason is that the government has a great deal to say about the important issues on the international scene, but little courage to follow up its statements with specific action.

I know that in foreign affairs the traditional wisdom says that you must move cautiously. I agree. In certain things you should exercise caution. But if we are to be respected in international affairs we must take a firm stand on the issues of the day. I do not need to reiterate Canada's position vis-à-vis the PLO, and the votes which Canada has or has not cast at various international gatherings.

The general tone of the foreign press, as I understand it, is that Canada now, unlike three decades ago when Canada was a leading moral force in the world, is a declining force. The foreign press says that we are declining rapidly. We are declining because the government will not take a strong stand on the great issues of our times.

One of the greatest issues confronting the world is the expansion of nuclear weaponry, the growth in the numbers of nuclear reactors, and the probability and possibility that other countries will explode atomic bombs. Canada faces a dilemma. What should our position be on this issue?

It was fairly easy to decide, say five or ten years ago, whether Canada should provide technological knowledge, and even material which would be used to explode nuclear bombs, and so on. It was fairly easy to decide such questions, because five or ten years ago the answer was clearly no, that Canada should not make it possible for other countries to make nuclear bombs. But the world has changed dramatically in the last few years. It changed drastically in September, 1973, when the OPEC countries decided to raise the price of oil. The OPEC cartel proved that there is now no security of oil supplies and that oil prices could be raised dramatically.

At that time in the world's history the technical use of nuclear power became an economic reality. Before then nuclear power had not been too important. Countries were