

When I read the NDP motion today, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but remember that the principal reason the NDP was obstructing—and the then Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody was the lead person for the NDP at that time—was that—Hon. Members of that Party have an opinion about the Senate of Canada, a negative opinion about its utility as an institution. Many of us on this side of the House share a lot of negative opinions about the utility of that institution. What this tells us is that the New Democratic Party believed that its principal objection to the institution of the Senate of Canada was clearly more important than the public examination of the nuclear issue. That is the sense of the reality of the New Democratic Party, that it would block a public inquiry of the energy issue some four years ago, an action step, because of an objection to the functioning of the Senate of Canada. It was not an objection necessarily to the individuals from that Senate who would have been named to that committee, but simply on principle an objection to the Senate of Canada. That tells us a fair amount about that Party's commitment to action is something different than its commitment to politics.

Every time I stand on my feet, Mr. Speaker, to debate an NDP motion or action plan, I hear the NDP express concerns about jobs, about health care, about the poor people in the country, about nuclear energy. I watched Hon. Members of that Party stand in this Chamber in December, 1979 and throw a government out of office which was producing more than 30,000 jobs a month. I saw them throw out a budget which was judged by the Canadian Welfare Council as the fairest to poor people in the generation of the seventies. I watched them block a public inquiry into the nuclear energy issue and throw that government out of office before it could overcome the blockage. I heard members of that Party talk about their concern for western Canada and I watched them throw out a government which had reasonable representation from western Canada and produce a government in which that representation is virtually nonexistent, much less than adequate. That government has given us a constitutional battle which is not over. It has given us an energy program which is close to bankrupting the nation because it is a Government which never understood the industry. It has given us the Crow rate which is in danger of bankrupting the western agricultural community.

The first time I was in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, at a nomination meeting, I heard the speaker, a provincial politician, stand up and lay out for that audience the western agricultural policy and the eastern agricultural policy of the New Democratic Party. They almost did not belong in the same room together, there was so much difference between them. That is the part of this motion which bothers me the most. It is really the hypocrisy of a Party which could not get its act together to support an action step in this direction and now wants the country called Canada and the people in it, four and a half years later, to believe that on an Opposition Day, with its motion, that Party is concerned about the issue. When that Party blocks an action step which could lead to resolutions which in turn could lead to improvement, then tries to create

Supply

the impression that it is concerned about it on a day when action is not possible, I suggest it is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the Canadian people.

I would like to ask—and I did ask the question of the last speaker of the NDP—why a royal commission instead of a House of Commons committee? What do we know in this Chamber about royal commissions? Our knowledge begins with the understanding that the chairman of the current commission in place receives more than \$800 a day and the members of that commission receive something approaching that. It is a job-creation project, Mr. Speaker, but for most Canadians, one day's salary would be a very good wage for a week. That is what we do when we create a royal commission. Would a royal commission do something very much different from what the bureaucracy now does? On the positive side, it would do a little more, it would create a slight amount of public awareness. However, after a royal commission gets itself a set of offices and a bureaucratic staff and begins to dig into an issue, it is not much different from an internal inquiry.

I suggest to the New Democratic Party that if it is really serious about the need for a public inquiry into this issue, the next time it is presented with this kind of opportunity, it reconsider the mechanism and whether or not a royal commission on this kind of issue, another technical group, is as important to the political resolution of the issue as a House of Commons committee, a body with elected people in it. Which is the better mechanism?

The other inadequacy of the motion which leaps out at anyone who has a real concern for issues such as disarmament and the nuclear threat, is the complete absence in the motion of the New Democratic Party of a single word which would lead the Canadian public to believe that it has any concern about the international situation and the proliferation of nuclear technology. It treats the nuclear issue as a totally domestic issue. We have heard speeches to the other effect, Mr. Speaker, but when it comes to the crunch, in framing a motion to bring to the House, it ignores completely the disarmament issue which it claims is its territory and an important part of NDP policy. How can those two things co-exist? That Party claims a sincerely felt deep commitment to disarmament in the nuclear area, but there is not indication in the motion dealing with nuclear energy that it has any concern about international proliferation. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is a slip. Perhaps it is just a very clear indication of schizophrenia in both the Liberal and the New Democratic Parties, an ambivalence between what is good politics and what those Parties really care about. This identifies for us that they are into playing politics and that real caring is not there. When the New Democratic Party is confronted with the possibility of acting, it does not act, it blocks. When it is confronted with the possibility of putting forward a political resolution, it does so in that spirit and forgets that there is another part of its politics which is concerned with disarmament, and so it is not included in that Party's resolution.