

INQUIRY WHETHER SAFEGUARD AGREEMENT PROHIBITS  
ARGENTINA FROM ESTABLISHING PLANT TO PRODUCE  
PLUTONIUM

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. When this matter was being discussed in the House some weeks ago, if I remember correctly the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that Argentina already had a small experimental separation plant capable of extracting plutonium from the waste from a CANDU reactor. Has the minister specifically put into the safeguards a provision either that Argentina will dispose of this separation plant or, even further, that it will not purchase or operate one? Are there any specific commitments that there will be no separation equipment in operation in Argentina so as to produce plutonium from waste from the CANDU reactor?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No, Mr. Speaker, the safeguards agreement was not intended nor could it apply over the whole field of nuclear operations in Argentina.

REASON GOVERNMENT NOT MAKING ADHERENCE TO  
NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY CONDITION OF SALE OF CANDU  
REACTOR

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Surely, it is ridiculous to talk about this being the strongest safeguards agreement in the world if it does not deal with the important question of whether or not a country which has a CANDU reactor can produce plutonium from the radioactive waste, plutonium being the material from which explosives are made. I want to ask the minister, in view of the fact that most countries which are anxious to co-operate in order to stop the proliferation of nuclear arms have signed the non-proliferation treaty, why the government has not insisted that in the case of Argentina, South Korea and indeed Pakistan they must sign and ratify the non-proliferation treaty as one of the conditions for purchasing a CANDU reactor from this country.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** We have not made membership in the non-proliferation treaty an absolute pre-condition.

**Miss MacDonald:** Why not?

**Mr. MacEachen:** In the case of the Republic of Korea, with the assistance of other countries and with a good deal of persuasion, we have secured the ratification of the NPT. That has not been the case with countries like Pakistan, for example, which have taken the view that the NPT is a discriminatory instrument. It is, of course, a discriminatory instrument, and for that reason they regard it as objectionable from their point of view. They will not ratify the treaty, even though in our view it ought to be ratified, but we have not made it a pre-condition of doing business with any particular country. What we have done up to the present time is ensure the strongest possible safeguards upon Canadian supplied materials and technology. We have not been able to go beyond that and include the total coverage of nuclear materials in that country.

*Oral Questions*

● (1420)

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** In view of the fact that the government rests its whole case for selling nuclear reactors in some of the troubled spots of the world on the ground that the developing countries are entitled to this technology to meet their particular economic needs and if Canada is prepared to take the risk of selling CANDU reactors, surely these countries should be prepared to play their part in this deal by acceding to a request to sign the non-proliferation treaty and to give firm guarantees that they will not procure separation plants to produce plutonium. I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs why Canada should not insist on this, particularly in the case of Argentina, where we are going to lose over \$25 million on the deal.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I have made the situation quite clear already—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. MacEachen:**—that we have not insisted nor do we intend at the present time to insist, as a precondition, on membership in the non-proliferation treaty because there are legitimate objections which can be taken to that treaty on the grounds of national sovereignty and the existence of discrimination, and the treaty is a discriminatory treaty.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BILINGUALISM**

POSSIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTING BILINGUAL AIR-TO-GROUND  
COMMUNICATIONS AT OTTAWA AIRPORT

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Considering that the principle of bilingualism was adopted by the House a few years ago, that the National Capital Region has an airport which is not provided with bilingual air-ground communications, and that this is a bilingual region, since 40 per cent of its population is francophone, could the minister advise the House whether he is considering the development of a bilingual communication system at the Ottawa airport?

[English]

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, it has been our intention to proceed with first things first, and that includes the attempts to develop the appropriate procedures for bilingual air traffic services in the province of Quebec, including the Montreal region. We are anticipating doing that. We have no plans in terms of a schedule beyond that, but we have always indicated the distinct possibility that, as we proceed to a conclusion with those steps, we would be examining the Ottawa region to see whether similar service ought to be extended there, in view of its geographic location and also in view of its nature as the national capital. I repeat, however, that we do believe that first things must come first, and that this is a matter which does require a step by step implementation. Therefore, we have been concentrating on introducing bilingual air traffic services in the province of Quebec.