

same commitment, based on GNP, as before, 35 per cent said that we should increase our commitment while only 23 per cent said that we should decrease our commitment. The Prime Minister must not be listening or reading what we are saying.

The Prime Minister said that we are against helping senior citizens. When delegates at that policy conference were asked if they support in principle a proposition that senior citizens should be guaranteed an income above the poverty line, the results of the poll indicated that 78 per cent were in favour of increased support for seniors while only 12 per cent said no. Yet the Prime Minister stood up in the House and said that we were against any increased help to senior citizens. From whom is the Prime Minister receiving his information?

He also talked about our opposition to hospital care. However, a full 76 per cent of Tory delegates wanted to maintain or increase spending on hospitals in this country. The Prime Minister must be living in a different world.

If the Prime Minister is prepared to stand up, representing the Liberal Party, and make such ridiculous statements, we can only assume that all members of the Liberal Party are of the same opinion. If they do not share that belief why do they not stand up and admit that their Party's policies are incorrect?

The Prime Minister went on to say that the Conservative Party is an anti Party, that we are against everything the Liberals say.

An Hon. Member: You are right. Tell us how it works.

Mr. Wright: I am surprised that a few of them are still awake. The people of Canada have opposed Liberal policies for the last four years and all the polls that have been conducted have shown that the people of Canada are saying it is time for a change. That is what will happen in the next few months. When the Prime Minister says that this is an anti Party, he is right. We are against everything the Liberals do. We are against their interest rates. We are against their economic policies. Some of us wonder about the type of government the Prime Minister has been leading for the last 15 years.

Mr. Gauthier: Good.

Mr. Wright: I hear the Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) saying it has been a good government.

Mr. Gauthier: Yes.

Mr. Wright: It will be goodbye to the Liberals in the next election. That is about all he will be able to say was good. After the election we will try to increase the number of people employed in Canada so that the Member for Ottawa-Vanier will not be unemployed.

Mr. Gauthier: Don't worry about that.

Mr. Wright: In conclusion let me say that when I heard the Prime Minister talk about people in this Party being "anti", I had to reflect on who is the real "anti" Member of the House. It is the Prime Minister. When our parents and relatives were

fighting the Second World War the Prime Minister was "anti". He was running around Montreal on his motorcycle wearing his German helmet. When our relatives were fighting in Korea in 1952, he was leading the Communist delegation to Moscow. We do not have a Prime Minister who is for anything, he is against everything. By accusing us, he is using the typical socialist rhetoric in an attempt to prove us wrong, when it is he who is "anti". The people of Canada are tired of his socialist experiment. They will have their day at the next election.

Adjournment Debate

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL BOARD—REGULATIONS GOVERNING WORKERS' SAFETY—REQUEST FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS. (B) INCREASE IN PERMISSIBLE RADIATION LEVEL

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise to add to some public conversation about an item that I have raised on three different occasions in the House. The first time was on Thursday, November 24, 1983, the second time was on Tuesday, December 13, 1983 and the third occasion was on Friday, December 16, 1983.

The issue I raised in Question Period on those three days was the proposal by the Atomic Energy Control Board to have in camera meetings at which it was going to discuss and study proposals to increase the radiation dosage to which many workers would be exposed. At those same in camera hearings, the AECB was proposing a number of changes that I thought would seriously affect the health of workers in that industry and their unborn children. Finally after my third intervention, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) agreed to have the press follow me into those meetings. At that point the Committee was still not allowing the press to go in with other groups who may have been making representations at the Control Board hearings. Since then I have heard that the Canadian Labour Congress will be allowed to take in press when it makes its presentation before the AECB. To my way of thinking, although it is a mild victory for us, this is still not good enough. When the Atomic Energy Board is looking into proposals which will affect the safety of workers and the safety of future generations, that is a matter which I do not believe we can study behind closed doors.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, about some of the risks under the new proposals. For example, women workers will now be exposed to radiation up to 500 per cent of what was formerly allowed. AECB has made this recommendation not because there are any new studies which indicate health is not threat-