

particular industry the question of occupational health and safety is critical. These people are working in a dangerous environment. They are exposed to very deadly materials. In the private sector, it is not difficult to visualize those standards being relaxed and a failure to adhere to the responsibilities that the corporate sector has in many other areas. The matter of occupational health and safety is a critical issue.

The second matter is the broader issue that also concerns the unions, the fact that they have 100 million tonnes of tailings that are not being properly handled. In the processing industry there are environmental concerns about the highly radioactive materials that come from that sector. They are not only concerned about the occupational health and safety on the job, but they are certainly concerned about the broader environmental impacts. They have children, they will have grandchildren, and they realize what the Government is proposing to saddle Canadians of future generations with.

Therefore, there is a great expression about the broad environmental concerns of the manner in which this industry is treated. In order to make a profit, and in order to maximize a profit for the companies that become involved in this privatization, there will be a very large incentive to relax the occupational health and safety and also the broader environmental concerns and standards. When a company does not invest in preserving those standards, it maximizes or improves its profit picture, and there is a serious incentive in the private sector to do this.

If a person believed that the nuclear industry in Canada was a useful contributor to the economy and the country instead of building a danger today and a time bomb for tomorrow, one could believe that it was a public utility, a thing that is so dangerous and of such great concern that it should be closely controlled and under the responsibility of the highest authority in the country, the federal Government.

When the nuclear industry first started in Canada, Canada took control of that industry under its discretionary power in the Constitution. That is the type of priority that Canada gave to it. Today the Conservative Government, in an act of what I and my colleagues would define as complete irresponsibility, is proposing to turn this over into the private sector where the motive for profit will place a constant constraint on occupational health and safety, and a constant constraint on spending in environmental protection. It has been repeated many times that only a Conservative would not learn by experience.

My colleague from Saskatchewan expressed great concern about the developments in the Wollaston Lake area, about the possibility of three mines being dug in this very environmentally sensitive area. Eventually those mines will produce hundreds of millions of tonnes of tailings that, unless the technology for handling those tailings is developed, will create another environmental danger and time bomb to be paid for by future Canadians. This enthusiasm, a clear signal that by turning this into the private sector and saying "Let's get rolling with it", by increasing the activity of the uranium mining in northern

Saskatchewan, by increasing the activity in British Columbia, is building a very serious problem for the future. If the Government was prepared to go to the polls on this issue alone, it would be defeated.

Mr. McDermid: You are dreaming in Technicolor.

Mr. Skelly: "Dreaming in Technicolor", say the Conservatives. If one can believe the former Minister for International Trade and her recent statements in Vancouver, we will be getting a chance to raise this in the polls this fall. She made a very clear statement that we will be going to the polls and we will in fact get a chance to read the Canadian—

Mr. McDermid: That is not her prerogative.

Mr. Skelly: I did notice that she was trying to cover her *derrière* today, and was having a great deal of difficulty doing it.

Mr. McDermid: What a sexist statement.

Mr. Skelly: We all have *derrières* and from time to time we are all forced to attempt to cover them. I tend to believe the former Minister for International Trade that we will be going to the polls, and we will certainly be getting an opportunity to test the population, and then we will see who is dreaming in Technicolor.

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Given comments made earlier by the House Leader of the New Democratic Party and supported by the Government, I think that there is a predisposition in the House to get this matter to committee. I notice that we are nearing the normal hour of adjournment. I would ask that you might seek permission of the House not to see the clock in the normal fashion in order that we might enable Members to make the comments that they want to make, yet still conclude, in order that we can move on to other important matters tomorrow, and perhaps even more important the committee can begin its work to examine the types of issues which the New Democratic Members are putting on the table. There will be expert witnesses, it would be helpful to the Canadian people, and it would be helpful to Parliament to have that examination begin as quickly as possible. I would like to seek unanimous consent of the House to not see the clock until we have disposed of this second reading debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Comox—Powell River.

Mr. Skelly: I would like to continue with the debate and the committee question. The committee question is that we are very concerned that the Government has attempted to limit the number of witnesses in a number of committees. If this Bill ever goes to committee, and we would hope that enlightened—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Do I understand from the Hon. Member that there is unanimous consent to continue the debate?