

Nuclear Proliferation

The hon. member also commented that India only derives a quarter of one per cent of its energy from nuclear fission. Well, Mr. Speaker, only 1 per cent of Canada's energy is derived from nuclear produced electricity. By the year 2,000 that will be in the order of 25 per cent. There is no reason for us to stop our nuclear program now and say it is not an important amount.

Another comment was to the effect that energy research and development are not being carried out in this country as they should be. This is erroneous, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) only a month ago in this House announced an extra \$10.6 million to be expended on energy research and development with respect to our needs for the next decade or two. The kind of energy options we are talking about, geothermal, tidal, solar and so on, are being worked on now but we will not see the benefits for ten, 20 or 30 years.

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) also made some comments which I believe were misleading and incorrect. He talked of a prominent scientist saying that we have an impending disaster. Any impending disaster in the nuclear weapon area is not going to be from Canada supplying the less developed countries with CANDUs.

An hon. Member: The disaster is over there.

Mr. Maine: Mr. Speaker, the disaster is on the opposite side of the House—with the New Democratic Party.

The hon. member also raised the question of the conditional statement that governments may be asked to return expended fuel, and asked why this was a conditional statement, and the reason for it. There is no reason to force ourselves into the possibly uneconomic proposal of having to repatriate any expended fuel. It may not be necessary, it may not be essential or economic—it may not even be possible. Why force ourselves into a commitment whereby we have to bring every ounce of expended fuel back?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to summarize by saying that I think the opposition in some of its generalities has misled this House by contending that the course we are taking is the wrong course; it is not the wrong course, it is the right course, and I fully support it.

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Maine) gave us the viewpoint of the scientist. I am sure he would not have us believe it is the only scientific point of view. I shall be quoting a few other scientists whose views are diametrically opposed to his, some of whom have given us the following scenario to consider.

I ask you to consider a band of terrorists in a developing country who steal some plutonium—which is not hard to do—from a newly constructed reactor, and build a nuclear device which, while amateurish, is effective. They load the device in a plane and fly it over London or New York city, any major city, and demand an astronomical sum of money. Not only the New Yorkers or Londoners, but the whole world knows that the dreaded moment of annihilation has come—and no one, anywhere, is safe.

I used to think this scenario was a bit too alarming but events are moving so fast in the specialized world of nuclear technology that I now believe people must be

[Mr. Maine.]

shocked into waking up to the grave dangers mounting throughout the world.

Canada is very much involved. We have become one of the leading exporters of nuclear material—primarily uranium, nuclear equipment, specifically CANDU reactors, as the motion before us brings to the forefront, and nuclear technology.

At the end of this year there will be 650 nuclear reactors operating in 38 countries. In addition to the principal nuclear powers such as the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France, and China, about a dozen more are on the threshold of nuclear strike capacity. Some countries have not ratified the non-proliferation treaty; of course this is a larger problem than Canada's involvement, but this country is obviously and admittedly in the race to export nuclear technology.

The former minister of energy, mines and resources who is now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) said in this House on December 20, 1974, when unveiling the nuclear policy of the present government, that Canada is in the race to enjoy the economic gains from sales abroad of major high technology components and services. I wish that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) had quoted from that speech this afternoon as justification for Canada's policy. I regret that he laid so much of the motivation for the pursuit of Canada's nuclear export policy on what he advances as a moral argument, the argument it would be helping developing nations. If he were going to lay such emphasis upon our responsibility to help developing nations I wish he had thought at the same time about realistic ways in which Canada can further that responsibility.

I waited for the minister to couple his arguments with, for example, the conference on the Law of the Sea being held in New York at the United Nations. Surely that would be a much more realistic way of helping developing nations—through the exploitation of mineral resources at the bottom of the sea including those on the continental shelf extending beyond Canada's 200 mile economic zone. The utilization of those mineral resources under an international authority or a concrete plan of revenue sharing would be a genuine move toward helping the developing nations. That would be a much more realistic way for us to take our responsibility, and a much safer way.

I could not believe my ears when I heard the minister lay such emphasis on our responsibility to help the developing nations through exporting technology. I hold in my hands Canada's official policy for helping developing nations, called "Strategy for International Development Co-operation 1975 to 1980" as outlined by the minister at the seventh special session of the United Nations General Assembly which reconfirmed the new economic order to which Canada gave its support. As I go through all 21 points I cannot find one item that deals with the export of nuclear technology.

When the government presents to us the rationale for the export of nuclear technology under the guise of helping developing nations I say that is a cover-up for the real motivation unveiled by the former minister of energy, mines and resources on December 20, 1974 when he said that we want to sell CANDU reactors. I wish the government would get its story straight. We are doing this either