

*Supply*

by its actions, which I proudly stand in this House and reflect and report, rather than by press accounts of so-called divisions within my party.

The minister talked about his party being in the mainstream. The use of the word "mainstream" applied to the Liberal government would be funny if it were not so tragic. The Liberal government is so far in the backwaters of Canada—and, indeed, the world—with its duplicity that I believe the minister would have been better advised to try to defend himself and his government against this motion; but I heard hardly a shred of rebuttal against the charges made in the motion.

The minister tried to defend the government's continuance of nuclear technology co-operation and the sale of 3,000 nuclear fuel bundles to Argentina in the midst of a situation the entire world knows is tragic. The world knows how the Argentine government conducts itself with respect to human rights, with respect to trust, with respect to violations of the United Nations Charter and with respect to invasion in contravention of international standards. This matter was referred to several times during the course of the minister's intervention. When there is a war going on it is absolutely shocking that the government should refuse to review its policy on nuclear sales.

Just before I speak about Argentina in some detail, I would like to refer to the fact that the minister also tried to divide my party. He began with the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He referred to him as a beached whale. I have always considered the hon. member for St. John's West to be a roaring shark snapping at the entrails of a government in total disarray.

The minister also said I do not have the support of all the members of my party. If I do not have their support, I would like to know how I come to be standing here at this very moment speaking on behalf of my party. I remind the minister—and I hope he has a chance to read this—that as part of the responsibility I have for speaking for my party on international development I made a statement on May 13, which has the full support of the hon. member for St. John's West, the hon. member for York North (Mr. Gamble) and the other members of my party. On May 13 I was speaking about the estimates of CIDA for this year. I said that if the government wants the support of the Canadian public at a time when our domestic economic situation is so serious, when the number of bankruptcies is up and when we have high levels of unemployment, inflation and interest rates and if the government wants to increase CIDA estimates, it will have to toughen up its whole operation and get tough with the bureaucrats here in Ottawa who are standing in the way of sound development practices. The government will have to get tough with those developing countries which are spending excessive amounts on arms and cutting back on development programs for their own people. The government will have to get tough with a communications program which can tell the Canadian people exactly what is going on.

I do not want to hear any more talk about divisions in my party. I hope the media are paying attention to my speech, if

we can ever find them present at a foreign policy debate. All the media want to do is try to poke holes in parties attempting to reflect deep Canadian concerns.

Let me talk now about the more serious of all Canadian concerns today in the field of foreign policy. One of them is the continuance of the sale of 3,000 nuclear bundles to Argentina at a time when we are increasingly concerned about the instability of that regime. On July 14, 1981, the subcommittee on Latin America and the Caribbean was examining this situation in some detail. The witness that day was Mr. James Donnelly, the president of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. I asked him in a summary question: "Can you give a guarantee to the committee that recycled fuel from the Candu reactor in Argentina will not be able to be used for a nuclear device?" Mr. Donnelly replied: "I certainly cannot give the committee or anybody else that assurance."

• (1640)

Since the start of the nuclear co-operation program with Argentina, we have known that there was the risk of nuclear fuel being siphoned off the nuclear reactor which went to Argentina as a result of the 1973 arrangement. The risk was clearly seen by the government of 1976 which imposed full-scope safeguards. It is bad enough that the government of that time left the sale of the Candu reactor in place without insisting that Argentina support the full scope safeguards, and it was bad enough that Argentina had not signed the non-proliferation treaty; but in light of the escalation of the war in the south Atlantic, and at a time when the trustworthiness of the Argentinian regime has been called into question and the government's leaked document said that Argentina is well on the way toward developing an indigenous nuclear fuel cycle that is completely free of safeguards—despite all that official concern that Argentina may manufacture an atomic weapon from its Canadian nuclear reactor, the government has refused to reconsider the full implication of its policy. It has refused to accept responsibility for the possibility that Canada may turn out to be an accomplice in the development of an Argentinian nuclear bomb.

What kind of government are we dealing with in Argentina? Since the military took over and formed the junta there has been a consistent policy of torture and murder of political opponents to the rightist government. Amnesty International estimates that 20,000 people disappeared after having been picked up by government security forces. There are thousands of political prisoners in jail. The military government has financed and armed private death squads. There is no freedom of the press in Argentina. No opposition political parties are allowed to function. There is no right to strike and no right to collective bargaining. Libraries and book stores have been purged of so-called leftist books which were burned in public.

As my colleague the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) properly remarks, Solidarity would never have been able to get off the ground in Argentina.

So much for the character of the regime, Mr. Speaker. Against this canvas of one of the most repressive juntas on the