

on what happened when the industry was subject to a vast lay-off under circumstances of government ownership.

Apart from the foolishness associated with privatizing the nuclear industry, one has to raise the question of whether in the long run it would be profitable for the private sector owners. In addition, there is the question of whether we should perpetuate this industry *ad infinitum*. Would it not be better to look in other directions and not place in the hands of private interests an opportunity to expand the nuclear industry? Would it not be better to put more commitment into exploration of alternative energy sources which would be renewable and non-contaminating, and based on the notion of sustainable development? It has been only a couple of weeks since we pointed out that there is such an alternative available to us in the form of hydrogen technology.

We have here, then, a proposition which is environmentally threatening and flies in the face of undertakings to move in the direction of sustainable development. It is economically doubtful in view of American action to restrain the import of uranium to the U.S. in flat contradiction of the free trade agreement. We have a deal that involves a stock flotation where, as my colleague indicated, the Canadian people will sell something they own and then turn around and have to pay for a great deal of the cost of that operation, with our taxes amounting to something in the order of \$350 million.

I will admit that this intervention is a kind of random walk through the considerations which apply to this legislation, intended for one purpose only, to demonstrate that the Hon. Member for Calgary West and his colleagues are so absolutely committed to their ideological imperative that they refuse to consider the implications of what they are doing, so overwrought are they with ensuring that further mergers and so on continue as a matter of principle. They believe they should encourage them for reasons which are perhaps not ideological in some instances, perhaps more patronizing in a certain sense, I might suppose. Certainly we heard earlier suggestions that mergers have been of economic benefit to this country. If that is the principle being applied here, then that is under question, too.

I will conclude by saying that it seems to me self-evident, as I am sure it is to my colleagues in this House, that this Bill should be hoisted. The Government should take some time to give some thought to the matter. I do not think Members opposite want to be accused again of doing something thoughtless and in an ill-considered manner, a reputation which they have rightfully earned. Here is an opportunity for them to withdraw, reconsider, and perhaps not do at all.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, they speak out of two sides of the mouth, maybe three. The NDP Government in Manitoba is in trouble in large measure because it is inappropriate for elected representatives, I believe, to have control of certain

kinds of management paths related to public enterprise. It is the management of Crown corporations where indeed elected Members of Parliament do not have the expertise that has got the NDP Government in trouble in Manitoba.

Mr. Waddell: Where?

Mr. Hawkes: Where? We will see on voting day just exactly the size of the trouble.

The arguments being advanced on the other side would force Canadians to conclude that when they go to the ballot box they should be choosing people who know how to run a mining and processing company. That is the logic of their argument; elected representatives are better able to manage a mining enterprise. I am sorry, but my background does not prepare me to manage a mining company. What I think I am asked to do when I come to this Chamber is to protect the environment, protect public health and safety, and produce a policy climate that will enable enterprises to flourish and jobs to be created. I am here to try to help people reduce their tax load so that they have more discretionary income and they can enjoy a higher standard of living.

We are dealing here with two Crown corporations, one owned by the Province of Saskatchewan and one by the federal Government. We are simply saying: amalgamate the two of them so we have a more efficient enterprise so when you do research into things like the environment you have more resources to do it and the environment is better protected. We will have a better marketing wing and the health and safety standards we lay down in this House of Commons, which is our job, will be better complied with by the company because it is a healthier enterprise.

I was in this Chamber when the Liberal Government of the day, supported by the NDP, decided to nose around in an industry and take control in many ways, control which Members of this Chamber were not prepared by background to take. That industry was the oil industry. I saw job losses, wife beatings and suicides as a result. I saw unemployment rise from 4 per cent to 12 per cent because a group of politicians on some kind of ego trip decided that they could run the world. Well, we cannot. Neither should we be responsible for running a mining operation. We were not elected to do it.

Years ago, when the markets and technology were brand new and private investors had no experience in this area, it may have been appropriate for Government to help get something started. However, we are now dealing with a tremendously sophisticated and competitive world-wide business. We need strong companies to compete successfully in markets around the world, and this is one of them. This is what that legislation is designed to do. We need it to be controlled and managed by knowledgeable people rather than not knowledgeable politicians.