

Private Members' Business

station would cost at least a trillion dollars and could lead to over 200,000 fatalities.

I could go on and on. That brings me to an important point, whether the nuclear energy sector is safe? I think this is fundamental in people's minds. It is certainly not economical. It is certainly environmentally unsound and I think that is a given. Is it safe?

Mr. Speaker, I think you will be shocked. During 1993 the Atomic Energy Control Board recorded 700 "unusual incidents" at Canada's 22 operating nuclear reactors. That is almost two a day. You are astonished. I am too. These incidents range from spills of radioactive heavy water to unexplained power surges. Of these, 270 were serious enough to warrant a full report to AECB and a follow up investigation. That is incredible, two incidents a day that warranted full scale investigations.

The annual reports of the Atomic Energy Control Board provide ample evidence of the inherent dangers of nuclear technology. The following really got me riled up in terms of having to do something to prevent this catastrophe that is about to happen. It is reported that in August 1992 radioactive heavy water from the Pickering A nuclear reactor leaked into Lake Ontario downstream from the water supply plants for the communities of Ajax and Whitby, forcing a shutdown of the plants. This incident resulted in the highest single emission of radioactive tritium into the lake since the reactor began operating in 1971.

This goes on and on. No wonder those whales are whipping up on the beaches in Quebec all scarred up, sick and blue. We have nuclear waste draining into the Great Lakes.

The 1992 annual report, the one that really got my attention, states that in March 1993 Ontario Hydro discovered a serious deficiency in the analysis of an accident involving a large loss of reactor coolant. The analysis showed that the consequence of such an accident, if it were to occur while operating at full power, would be unacceptable. The term unacceptable is a euphemism for a disaster, probably.

They are not safe. They are not economical. They are environmentally unsound. They are a threat to our health and they are breaking the treasury. Why on earth would we continue on this sort of treadmill to nowhere, forking out that kind of taxpayers' money?

• (1830)

Mr. Speaker, my time is quickly coming to an end. So I will sit down now while I wait for my friends across the way to explain to the taxpayers of Canada how this incredible subsidy ought to continue.

Hopefully, a little lightning bolt will come out of the sky and give them a little snap so they will say: "Yes, tomorrow morning

I am going to walk over to the Minister of Finance's desk, sit down beside him and say: "Mr. Minister of Finance, it is time to end this madness. Save the taxpayers of Canada hundreds of millions of dollars. Bring them a safer environment, a healthier environment and something that is economically and environmentally sound now". The only way we can do that is to stop funding Canada's nuclear sector.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Earlier in his intervention the member referred to the Speaker being shocked. I am not so sure about that, but I am still looking for that little town in the Chinese province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, well here we go again. The NDP party with the same bill it brought in before. The same old party. The same worn out rhetoric. The same wrong conclusions—

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to hear the hon. member's speech however, he mentioned the NDP party. Think about it. That would be the New Democratic Party party. If he is going to refer to us, at least say the New Democratic Party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Respectfully, the member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was very kind because I have heard them called worse.

I want to remind the hon. member that Ontario Premier Bob Ray stood with the Prime Minister of Canada when we sold two reactors to China. He was so proud of our Canadian technology. I know he got into a bit of criticism over that, but he understands what research and development means and we respect him for that.

This bill will prevent the federal government from giving any financial assistance or technical support to nuclear reactor projects, except those making isotopes for medical use.

The hon. member made a great deal out of wasting money. Let me state one important point right off the bat, and this is for Canadian consumption in view of what the hon. member has said. From 1952 to 1992 the Canadian government invested \$4.7 billion in Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. During the 30 year period from 1962 until 1992 the nuclear industry in Canada had a return for Canadians of \$23 billion. Now, if we are going to get a return of \$5 for every dollar invested, I do not think that is a bad investment.

NDP members have learned one thing. It took them some time to learn it, but they learned that isotopes are useful in medicine. Radioisotopes have various applications. One use is for sterilizing medical instruments. The hon. member does not seem to understand that cobalt 60 which is a byproduct from Ontario Hydro's power reactors is an isotope product. He wants to