

### Adjournment Debate

tion to heart, Mr. Speaker, and wrote to the minister on June 18 asking him what exactly he had in mind.

I received a response by letter of August 19, 1980. I would read part of it into the record as it is germane to the question tonight. The minister said in part as follows:

As you are aware, slower economic growth in Canada and throughout the world has reduced the growth rate of electricity demand. This, in turn, has reduced the demand both in Canada and abroad for AECL's Candu reactors. In consequence, I have asked that in the first phase of our nuclear policy review, emphasis be placed on the status of the industry and its prospects over the decade. As part of the review, we will be examining the policy options open to the government should it appear that support is required beyond that which current policy entails.

There are, of course, other significant areas which need to be examined as part of the policy review and, subsequent to completion of the industry's study later this year, we will turn our attention to them. Included in the list are radioactive waste management, revisions to the Atomic Energy Control Act, and uranium export policies.

You inquired about public input into the review process. Once the study of various aspects is further advanced, I intend to release documents for public comments. It might also be advisable to set up a parliamentary task force to review those documents. In addition, officials of my department have recently been in contact with several non-governmental organizations with an active interest in energy issues in general and nuclear energy in particular.

● (2215)

We now have the situation where the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has indicated there will be no parliamentary review and the minister has indicated that he is considering a parliamentary review on this particular topic. One year has gone by since the government gained the opportunity to deal with this matter. It is incumbent upon us now to ask what are the terms of reference and their content, when does the government intend to bring them down and what about the parliamentary task force. Or are we to wait for maybe another year before the government acts on this matter?

I would remind the parliamentary secretary that if our resolution had been passed and the matter referred to committee, we would now be in the position of expecting a report in the very near future. Delay and inaction on nuclear policy is the trademark of this government to the detriment of the Canadian public.

**Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, on the matter of representations to the government relative to nuclear industry, issues which the hon. member for Saskatchewan West has raised, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources explained in the House on June 11 in response to an earlier question by the hon. member that a formal task force with specific terms of reference has not been established for the nuclear industry review now under way within the government. He noted, however, that there will be an opportunity for public input when documents dealing with a series of nuclear industry related questions are completed and released.

The interdepartmental study on nuclear industry issues is being conducted as part of the development of a broad energy strategy. Although formal public hearings are not part of this nuclear industry review, the government has had the benefit of extensive hearings held elsewhere in Canada and, in any case,

it is the intention of the government to be fully cognizant of views coming from the public on the nuclear industry issues before making policy decisions.

When the decision stage is reached, we shall examine ways in which Parliament and the public can best express their views about proposals put forward at that time. Views of members of this House or organizations and individuals outside the House will certainly be welcomed and taken into consideration.

We believe nuclear energy can play an increasingly important role in helping to meet Canada's future energy needs. There remain, however, questions in the minds of some regarding its application on a larger scale. The government's energy program is designed to come to grips with those questions in the context of a total national energy strategy.

The assessments to be completed in the coming months will provide the policy framework for the decisions required to ensure an appropriate role for nuclear energy in the future. The decisions regarding that role must serve the national in all respects and, accordingly, will encompass informed public views. The government expects to issue background papers on nuclear industry matters in the near future. These papers will help to provide the basis for the development of informed public views on important nuclear industry questions.

● (2220)

#### HEALTH CARE—HALL REPORT—RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING EXTRA BILLING BY DOCTORS

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill):** Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to try and obtain from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), or from her parliamentary secretary on her behalf, a clear enunciation of what she intends to do in order to bring about one of the main recommendations of the review by former Justice Emmett Hall on medicare in Canada, the outlawing of extra billing.

There are many other recommendations of Mr. Justice Hall that we in the NDP would like to see implemented. I mention briefly just some of them—the abolition of premiums, the promotion of community health care models, the abolition of user fees, the promotion of preventive and rehabilitative medicine, and cost-sharing with poorer provinces to widen the scope of health care services in these provinces. We agree with Mr. Justice Hall that the original vision of a comprehensive health care system in Canada has not been fulfilled, and we will do our part to ensure that eventually it is.

But the recommendation to outlaw extra billing, the practice whereby doctors charge their patients over and above what medicare pays, must be dealt with immediately. Its continuation will, as Mr. Justice Hall rightly points out, lead to the eventual destruction of medicare as we have come to know it by creating a two-tier system of health care in Canada. If it continues, then some people will move to insure themselves against this extra cost through private insurance schemes. This, we submit, would be the beginning of the end of medicare.