

*Business of Supply*

South Korea President Park Chee Hung has just placed Canada in a very embarrassing position. On June 12 he announced that his country:

... although it has signed the nuclear arms non-proliferation treaty may change its policy and manufacture atomic weapons if the United States, after its rout in South East Asia, decides against protecting it under its atomic umbrella.

In spite of that, Mr. Chairman, we would sell CANDU to South Korea? What concerns us in this matter is the attitude of Canada.

[English]

When a minister of the government can travel throughout the Arab world seeking to sell our reactors to nations that have been involved in belligerent activity for the last 25 years, I am forced to ask myself whether our minister can speak happily of introducing a nuclear component into, of all places, South Asia. I have to ask myself whether we have lost control of all our senses. When our minister can speak highly of introducing nuclear weapons into an area of renowned political instability such as South America where, by the way, the more typical form of government is a ruling military junta, I have to ask myself whether we have lost all control of our senses.

Surely we can establish some criteria for the sharing of this technology that is in line with our sense of conscience and the financial means of our own country. Surely we can develop criteria with reference to the stability of governments, the democracy of governments, the degree to which government activity is a matter for public discussion in the country involved, and the degree to which that country is or is not involved in potential belligerent situations before we embark holus-bolus upon wide scale proliferation of our nuclear technology.

Clearly a nation which is involved repeatedly in belligerent activities, either as a result of its own posture or the posture of its neighbours, should not be a nation with whom we are prepared to share nuclear technology. A nation with less than a stable tradition of democratic government should not be one of those with which we are prepared to share our nuclear technology. A nation whose posture with reference to the free world is not friendly should not be one with which we are prepared to share our nuclear technology. I do not believe these to be particularly difficult criteria. I do not believe them to be unreasonable or unfair. Above all, Madam Chairman, they are responsible, and that must be the ultimate criterion for the sharing of nuclear technology.

● (1630)

The government's irresponsibility, lack of co-ordination, and lack of any firm position of principle on the CANDU is very sad. It is sad because it sells short the many first rate public servants in External Affairs, in Industry, Trade and Commerce, and in National Defence, who have been expressing concern with reference to the CANDU for some time. It is sad because it represents and indeed must appear to represent to the world the desperate efforts of a nation facing economic difficulty to gain short-term economic yardage at some very real long-term prices.

[Translation]

Another aspect of the ambiguous attitude of the federal government regarding CANDU is the joint France-Quebec

[Mr. Wagner.]

project for an enriched uranium plant which, according to some viewers, would make a suitable addition to CANDU, and according to others would compete dangerously with our present industry of natural uranium to the point of threatening it with bankruptcy.

Whilst the Canadian government has not yet worked out a policy in this respect nor even given any reliable indication of what it intends to do to reconcile the interests of Canadians at large with those of Quebecers, it plans—in cooperation with Quebec—to initiate new “feasibility” studies to quote a term used by Mr. Ségard. However, Mr. Ségard, the French Minister for Exterior Trade, when he visited Ottawa on June 9, stated:

To undertake such a study, we have to be aware of the political will of the federal government, to know if this can and must be done.

Let us just try to fathom the political will of this government! This is another mystery, to use a word dear to Mr. Ségard.

Ambivalence also is the attitude taken by our government in matters of international development, of international help. On the one hand, as Laurent Laplante pointed out, the attitude of the Canadian government in the face, for instance, of the Haitian problem, of those who are about to be deported, has shown clearly that Canada was making too obvious a difference between the rules of hospitality and its conception of the economic interest.

On the other hand, and on the whole, either the bilateral program of CIDA aim at the sole development and must then be maintained or they aim also at helping undertakings here and, it must be recognized, not only in front of businessmen but also in front of hon. members, in front of citizens and in front of recipient countries.

So many questions concerning CIDA, its orientation, its management, have been raised since February 20, mostly in this House, in committee, in the various media across the country, that at least one thing has been evidenced, namely the ambivalence of Canada in matters of international development. And I refer here in particular to the questions raised by my colleague from Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Mackenzie).

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, if there is an area where the sayings and doings of Canada, where its reputation should not be tainted with epithets such as “vague”, “inconsistent”, “soft” or “ambivalent”, it is certainly the development area which, on account of its object, must sublimate all the other political and economic surveys.

Therefore, we on this side of the House, eagerly wish that a government member will take advantage of this day to enlighten us on Canada's position at the special United Nations conference on development which is due to meet in September. It is perhaps the last opportunity we shall have during this session before the adjournment to get acquainted with the position and to examine it.

In the same breath, we finally reiterate our request for a department of State for External Affairs for CIDA, or rather for the institution of CIDA as a Department of International Development. Such a department would first allow Canada to intensify its presence on the international scene, improve its image abroad, and another thing equally important, it would enable Canadians and Parlia-