

the nuclear threat and the threat of nuclear proliferation. The countries which have nuclear technique want to retain it and use it for their own purposes. Some manufacture bombs for their own purposes and some, like Canada, use these techniques for peaceful purposes. The countries which have the technique are trying to persuade those which do not to accept the fact that half a dozen countries or so have the technology and the others do not.

The means of persuading these other countries to accept this fact is the sharing of the technology which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) emphasize so frequently. They emphasize that this is part of the obligation Canada undertook in signing the non-proliferation treaty; that is, the obligation to share. But the Secretary of State for External Affairs almost took the position today that one is either for or against sharing. That is not the point we are making.

I do not want to overemphasize the importance of the development of power by nuclear technology. I do not want, necessarily, to subscribe to the view expressed by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that the development of nuclear technology is necessarily the main alternative to the development of power from fossil fuel. He may be right. However, I notice that the *Economist*, for example, questions this. The *Economist* is quite critical of the fact that the AIEA, which is supposed to be an international control and inspection agency, is spending two-thirds of its budget on promoting the development of power from nuclear sources around the world. But even if the Secretary of State for External Affairs is right in thinking that nuclear power is the main alternative to power developed from fossil fuel, do we have to accept one or the other alternative that he has put before us today? Are we prepared to sit here and be embarrassed by the fact that he chastises us and suggests that because we are critical of the conditions under which Canada is sharing its knowledge, and under which it is entering into contracts, we want to be isolationists; we want to simply sit on our knowledge and we do not want to share anything—in fact, that we want to be inward-looking? I reject that.

● (1650)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I like and admire the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but I have to say to him that it is a cheap debating manipulation to suggest that those who were criticizing the government for the deals it is making are simply inward-looking, dog-in-the-manger people who are not prepared to share advanced technology with the rest of the world.

The question is: Can we not work out methods under which this technology can be safely shared? Those who are urging a moratorium are, I am certain, not taking the position that they want to be dogs-in-the-manger, nor that they want to prevent the development of underdeveloped countries; but they think it is wiser to take a little more time in the international community, particularly among those nations which have the technology, working out, in co-operation, a safe method of sharing this technology.

Nuclear Proliferation

So it is not just a question of sitting on it; it is not a question of members in the opposition parties either being in favour of the government's programs or against any kind of sharing at all. What we are concerned about, and what we are prepared to face and confront, is the great challenge that is not put fairly before the House or before the Canadian people by a minister who suggests it is either a question of sharing they way this government is sharing, or simply taking a narrow, inward look.

I say that Canada has particular reasons to be careful in discharging its responsibility, for two reasons. First, there is the fact, as has been pointed out frequently, that the CANDU reactor generates more plutonium than the alternative methods of developing power from nuclear sources. Second, there is the bitter experience in India to which the minister referred this afternoon. Yet Canada seems to be prepared to run risks to make sales of its reactors.

Let us look at the customers. South Korea is in a very unstable part of the world. It is in the process of negotiating a deal for a processing plant. It is said that it has no longer the intention of acquiring a processing plant; but so far as I know, the government of Canada has not received an assurance, for whatever it might be worth, from the government of South Korea that it will not acquire a reprocessing plant during any definable term of years. Argentina is not a signatory of the non-proliferation treaty. Terrorism is rampant there and there is instability in the country. Yet Canada is now negotiating the contract and it has very quickly entered into a contract for nuclear technology without any real care about ensuring an adequate standard of safeguards.

Then there is the Italian deal under which Canada was licensing an Italian company to manufacture CANDU reactors and re-export that technology. What has happened to that deal? Where does it stand? What assurances can the minister or anybody give us about safeguards with respect to that arrangement? Then there is Pakistan which also is not a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty. There must be a great temptation for the government of Pakistan to try to develop a bomb in response to what has happened in India. Then there is India itself which has used Canadian technique and resources to achieve a nuclear explosion.

I think it is right, and I think it is our duty to ask ourselves whether we should be in this business on these terms, taking these high risks. The minister admits that there are risks involved, and I suppose there will always be some risks. But is it good enough simply to boast that our safeguards are the highest in the world, when he admits that there are risks and everybody can see that? Has the minister any real confidence that these safeguards are adequate? Has he any real confidence that these safeguards can prevent happening in other countries what has happened in India? Why does the government want to impose this kind of a risk on the conscience of the Canadian people?

The minister says we want to enter into a moratorium. A moratorium does not mean that we will forgo all this business for all time; it means that we will not make any deals until we are satisfied that we have made a real effort to get an international mechanism that really works. He says we will forgo sales. I think the Canadian people would be prepared to forgo sales to permit that kind of