

We have taken on these responsibilities, and one of them is to share our expertise and materials in this field with other countries of the world. Such a policy as advocated by the opposition would not only mean the cessation of sales of the CANDU reactor; it would have grave consequences domestically and internationally.

The power requirements of Canada's nuclear partners would be seriously jeopardized in the case of CANDU which in each instance is an integral part of the power program of those states. Pakistan is a good example. The Honourable Member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) would presumably want us to throw our weight around in Pakistan. That is a possibility; we could cease co-operation and we could black out the city of Karachi by denying them their power source. That is a possibility which could be considered. In the case of uranium sales, the vital energy situation of some of Canada's most important trading partners, such as Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom, among others, would be jeopardized. I suggest, too, that a moratorium, if it is said we exclude uranium, would bring about a radical dislocation of Canada's uranium mining industry which, following the downturn demand over the past decade, is only now able to develop its full potential and play the important role in the economy of which it is capable.

I was in the House of Commons in the sixties when the bottom fell out of the international uranium market, resulting in the dislocation of the industry at Elliot Lake and a consequent need for immediate compensatory action on the part of the federal government. So if we cease to participate in these developments, if we cease to supply equipment, technology and fuel, the consequences would be both domestic and international. In addition, we would lose whatever influence we have as a partner in this business of upgrading general nuclear standards. It is a policy which I do not recommend to the House of Commons, and I doubt whether anyone on this side of the House will find much difficulty in voting against the ill-conceived motion put forward by the Honourable Member for Northumberland-Durham.

Honourable Members opposite have been complaining about secrecy; they say they have been kept in ignorance and do not know what is going on. Mr. Speaker, on January 30 I tabled the agreements we signed with the Republic of Korea and with Argentina. I have also tabled a comprehensive statement on Canada's nuclear safeguards policy, the total background for the benefit of Honourable Members who wanted to be enlightened, who wanted to be in possession of more facts, who wanted to dispel the ignorance in which they have been so deeply immersed by members of the government. I notice that in the three speeches made, not a word was said about the safeguards policy; not a word was said about the agreements. No suggestion was made as to ways in which we might improve, if possible, the system of safeguards we have in effect.

The safeguards as reflected in those two agreements are extremely important. Honourable Members clamoured for those agreements; they were clamouring for an opportunity to study them. Today we find ourselves engaged in a debate on the subject, and I have been waiting for some enlightenment as to means by which those safeguard agreements might be improved. None was forthcoming. Maybe Honourable Members across the way would like a moratorium on those, too.