

them; if they fool you twice, shame on you. Surely, the minister has a responsibility to stop playing this game of hide-and-seek. He has a responsibility this afternoon, in the course of this debate, to tell the Canadian people whether we are thinking seriously of lifting the ban which we very properly placed on India after it broke its pledged word. Also, if we are going to lift that ban, to what extent, and for what purpose?

Let us not allow the minister to tell us, as he has done so often, that we are insisting on the very highest safeguards in the world. Safeguards are worth nothing unless the people who give them are the kind of people on whom we can rely. Certainly, none of the safeguards the government has been able to produce to date have been worth the paper they have been printed on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What we in the New Democratic Party have been demanding is that there be a moratorium on the sale of nuclear plants, technology and fuels until such time as the seven producing nations have been able to formulate a treaty which will place a ban on nations which have not signed the non-proliferation treaty and all those nations which are not prepared to forgo purchasing reprocessing plants. No single nation can enforce provisions like that. Only the seven nations which sell nuclear technology and nuclear plants are able to do that if by treaty they agree that when any nation breaks the safeguard agreement, that nation will not be able to purchase from any of the supplying countries either plants, repairs, parts, uranium fuel, heavy-water or anything else which they require to carry on their nuclear operations. Until we get that kind of agreement, and until the producing nations are prepared to institute that kind of treaty which will enable the producing countries to impose sanctions and to enforce their safeguards, then I say that we ought not to be selling nuclear reactors outside this country.

When this was suggested to the minister on the day on which he announced the sale of the nuclear reactors to South Korea and Argentina, I thought the reply of the minister was one of the most damning indictments I ever heard any minister make of himself and of the government to which he belongs. As reported at page 10493 of *Hansard* of January 30, 1976, the minister said, with reference to a moratorium:

Probably it would result in Canada's losing sales to other nuclear suppliers, and we would also lose whatever influence we are exercising—

That it would result in Canada's losing sales is a significant statement. Josh Billings once said that when a man says, "It ain't the money, it's the principle of the thing—it is the money." I think it is very significant that the monetary consideration seems to have taken precedence over moral considerations in the matter of the sale of nuclear reactors. Of course the people of Canada want to trade with other countries; of course they want to develop export sales. But I submit that the great majority of the Canadian people are not willing to pay the price of endangering the peace of the world in order to enable the government to sell two or three nuclear reactors in the trouble spots of the world.

Nuclear Proliferation

● (1550)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I hope that the minister will today make a full and detailed explanation to this House of the negotiations that have been going on with India. We are not asking the minister to tell us what will appear in the final agreement; but when he sent, or somebody else sent, the delegation to New Delhi they must have had some idea of why the discussions were going to be carried on. They must have known whether Canada, under certain conditions, would consider raising the ban on nuclear sales to India. We ought to know what those considerations are. Surely this House ought to know that long before an agreement is signed.

We are dealing with something that is far too important, in terms of human survival, to follow the old, diplomatic conditions of the nineteenth century which say that a government has power to sign an agreement then toss it on the floor of the House and give members ten or fifteen minutes to express an opinion on it. Surely the time has come, on so crucial a question, that these matters ought to be discussed in this House and in the standing committees of the House. Members of this parliament ought to have some input before the government makes a decision which could bring the world into a conflagration.

I do not think the Canadian people are going to accept the idea that all these negotiations regarding nuclear sales should be carried on in the hush-hush of diplomacy and that parliament and the people of Canada should be kept in ignorance of something which may well affect them, their children and their children's children for generations to come. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we want the minister to come clean; to tell the House what is going on, and whether he is willing, in view of what happened with India and in view of the reprocessing plants that have been bought by some other countries with which we have been negotiating, to consider a temporary moratorium until such time as the seven supplier nations, who have been meeting and making some progress, are able to devise an arrangement by which we can guarantee that sales of nuclear reactors will not increase the nuclear capacities of countries which may use them to disturb the peace of the world and threaten the survival of mankind.

[Translation]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, the motion now before us makes us think very seriously and very deeply, indeed. As a matter of fact, a country such as ours, known first and foremost for its peaceful role, as an example for all nations of the world, how can such a country justify nuclear aid to a country such as India?

I want to commend the mover of this motion because, in my view, we must act in a logical manner and with what is known as good horse sense. Mr. Speaker, geographically Canada is in such a situation that we wonder ourselves why we accept to have nuclear weapons. We are even wondering why we accept to have all kinds of weapons we could do without because between the United States on the one hand, our neighbours to the south and the Soviet Union on the other hand, our neighbours to the north, it is quite obvious that with our small population, we look like a pygmy between two giants, and it is absolutely ridicu-