

the hon. member for Vaudreuil questions it. He does not have the courage to stand up and defend the safeguards that are in place. These could be changed or downgraded.

● (1730)

Of course, Mr. Speaker, he did not have the courage either to stand in his place and make the charges against me personally that he made outside the House. That seems to indicate what he is all about. I found it rather interesting that he knew he could not make those kinds of allegations in the House and defend them under the rules. No. What happened was that in the CP story of June 13 this year it said:

Herbert, MP for the Montreal riding of Vaudreuil, told the Commons yesterday afternoon that a former Progressive Conservative cabinet minister apparently interfered with Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd., the Crown agency that sells nuclear technology, and effectively ensured a breakdown in communications with Argentina.

Herbert did not name MacDonald in the House but confirmed later she was the cabinet minister to whom he was referring.

He said the charge was based on a complaint made by one of his constituents interested in the sale of reactors.

I find that to be one of the most invidious ways of going outside the House. The hon. member would not name the minister in the House of Commons, would not name the constituent, and would not name what the charges were that the constituent was upset about. None of this would he do in the House of Commons. Of course he would make all sorts of allegations outside. That is exactly what I expected from the hon. member for Vaudreuil.

It is rather interesting that we see more and more of this deterioration of Liberal concern for the maintenance of nuclear safeguards in this country and as we apply them to other countries. When you look at what the hon. member for Vaudreuil is doing, obviously he seemed to want to make sales of Candu reactors to Argentina under any conditions whatsoever, just accept anything. I say to him that this is not the same as going out and selling other commodities. The sale of a nuclear reactor or nuclear technology has within it the potential for destruction of people around the world in a way that no other commodity has. The hon. member for Vaudreuil should be prepared to face up to that, and face up to the responsibility that goes with being a member of the House, certainly the responsibility that being a member of the government carries with it on matters such as this.

This afternoon when the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) was questioned about further sales to Argentina and under what conditions, he evaded giving direct answers. Of course he did. Even the hon. member for Vaudreuil must know that now we are getting into a series of discussions that are shrouded in secrecy between cabinet ministers, AECL, and officials from Argentina. They certainly could allow for our safeguard standards to be lowered. I hope that every concerned member in the House of Commons would fight against that, including even the hon. member for Vaudreuil.

It would be interesting if he would expand his motion to cover what was going on in April of this year when Admiral

Candu Reactor Sales

Madeira paid his visit to Ottawa to meet with ministers of the Crown and members of AECL, to conduct negotiations with regard to sales of Candu reactors. In that way he could find out exactly what was the *quid pro quo* for writing off the additional losses that AECL has had because of the bad business practices and maladministration of their work in Cordoba in the building of the Embalso plant. It would be interesting to know what the *quid pro quo* is. It would be interesting to know whether the hon. member for Vaudreuil is aware that his government is prepared to write off \$30 million or more as a result of the way the whole enterprise has been mishandled from beginning to end, since the time it went into effect.

We had a situation where a reactor was sold by AECL to Argentina. That sale, through several renegotiations, cost the Canadian people \$130 million. Already we have had to pay that amount for selling them this reactor. The cost has gone even higher, and discussions are now under way between our government and Argentina as to how to cover that loss. That is something that perhaps the hon. member for Vaudreuil will include in his motion so that we have all the material out on the table and under public scrutiny when we are looking at the question of AECL.

As a number of my colleagues have said, had we been able to pursue the public nuclear inquiry that the Clark government had set up, all of this would be common knowledge now. It would all be in the public domain. However, what happened to the government of which the hon. member is a part? Immediately it wraps a mantle of secrecy around everything it is doing.

Of course it is not what the government is doing that the hon. member really wants to know. It is not the current situation with regard to Argentina that he wants to know anything about. No, indeed. It is not the write off of \$30 million, further losses, or anything of that nature. He really wants to duck the whole issue. That is what I find rather interesting in that he simply does not understand the situation. He does not want to know the facts, and certainly does not seem to care one little bit about Canada's maintenance of the safeguard policy.

It would be interesting if he would look at what went on last summer when some of us who felt strongly about safeguards argued that there should be no lessening of safeguards on the sale of nuclear equipment and nuclear technology, regardless of whether it is to Argentina, Pakistan, India, Brazil, South Africa, Israel or any other country that has not signed the non-proliferation treaty. We have already seen the kinds of damage, problems, and situations the world is placed in when those safeguards are not in place.

I would hope the hon. member for Vaudreuil would enlarge upon the motion he has put forward to include all of the documentation from AECL going back to 1974 when the Embalso plant first saw the light of day. If we have all of the documentation on the table, he can take a clear look at the difficulties caused by the procrastination and ill-founded documentation put forward by AECL.