

Supply

radioactive poisoning that we got out of the Chernobyl incident over and over and over again as these reactors in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, each one of them eventually, come to some unhappy end.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, I was amazed at the evidence of new dinosaurism in the member's comments today, particularly when it deals with Atomic Energy of Canada and our nuclear expertise; known throughout the world, leaders in the world in science and medicine. He complains about food irradiation because he does not understand it. He says, my gosh, if you irradiate those potatoes so that they won't grow on the shelf and develop bugs in them and will be safe for people to consume, there is something terribly wrong about that because you have stopped the normal decay process.

That is new dinosaur activity from a new dinosaur party. Surely to goodness, when we have developed the safest and soundest reactor system in the world to produce electricity, where we have been in the forefront of nuclear medicine, where we have been in the forefront of learning how to preserve fruits and vegetables with irradiation, why should we abandon this because it is not within the understanding of the New Democratic Party, formerly the CCF which developed its philosophy in 1935.

The member comes from Winnipeg, a progressive city. I am just amazed how he could all of a sudden pull in these horror stories and worry about a Chernobyl when he knows that our reactors are safe and he knows that our reactors are efficient, when he know our nuclear medicine plays a leadership role in the world, and complain about the program. He says: "Well, we can always keep the nuclear industry around just to clean up the messes of others". This is such drivel. I make that comment because it surprises me that the New Democratic Party is such a dinosaur party.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Mississauga South has done it again. I do not know how many times I speak in this House and he comes in at a certain point, not having heard everything that I said, and attacks me for saying things that I did not say. I never

put down the medicinal dimension of nuclear technology. I complimented Canadian expertise and said it ought to be put at the disposal of the world.

The member says that there is something wrong with our party because we devised our philosophy in 1935. It was actually 1932 and 1933. However, he makes no apology for the fact that his party quotes Adam Smith who formed his policies in the 1700s. If we just want to talk chronologically, it is not very debatable about who is more up to date. The fact is that neither Adam Smith nor anything said in 1932 or 1933 are applicable to today's situation. It is a question of trying to figure out what is applicable to today's situation.

I was simply making the argument that jobs in the nuclear industry do not depend on us pursuing a nuclear energy option. There are jobs in the nuclear industry in this country that would continue and would continue to be important even if we made that choice and we would still have an international role to play.

The member is not really interested in genuine debate. He wants to get up and caricature what I had to say. What I do find interesting, and this relates to what I said earlier in my speech, is that he did not get up and say anything about the trust tax exemption.

Some hon. members: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Blaikie: You cannot even get them to acknowledge that this is happening. You get up and ask a question about apples and they get up and throw oranges back at you. Why does the member not address that particular issue? He will not because it is embarrassing. It embarrasses all of them, what we over here call the Upper Canada clause. It embarrasses them that they are such toadies for the corporate elite in this country that they would do something that is so absolutely contrary to all their rhetoric about deficit reduction.

Mr. Blenkarn: A quick supplementary, Madam Speaker. Perhaps the member could tell me the bill that is going to abolish this great tax loophole that is before the House. Maybe he could tell me what the bill is so I can refer to it and read it. I am as interested as he is in the bill that we are going to have to vote on to abolish these tax loopholes.