

*The Address—Mr. de Jong*

● (1110)

With all respect to the Bishops' statement, I have not found sufficient recognition of the need for this balance. They have served us well in calling us back from an unbalanced reliance upon technology, but I wish for a far greater recognition of the need for balance in their statement and in the Hon. Member's address.

**Mr. de Jong:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has a point. The fact is that the balance right now tips so much to the capital intensive side that there is very little recognition by industry or by government of that which the Bishops call appropriate forms of technology. In their statement, the Bishops said:

This does not imply a halt to technological progress but rather a fundamental re-ordering of the basic values and priorities of economic development.

I should like to give the Hon. Member one example in the energy field. If one invested the same amount of capital needed to build a nuclear reactor into home insulation, one would save more electricity than the nuclear power plant would ever produce. Home insulation is not capital intensive. It produces more work and it provides self-sufficiency for the consumer. The consumer would be no longer dependent upon the utility company and would no longer have to pay tremendous bills every month to pay off the cost of the nuclear power plant plus the interest on the debt.

Here are two different visions of development. We can go the nuclear route, which is capital intensive and environmentally questionable producing very expensive electricity; or we can go the route of home insulation and conservation. The same amount of money spent on the conservation side would surely bring much more benefit to ordinary people than going the nuclear route. Yet the Government in its statement slashes the Canadian Home Insulation Program and the program of developing alternate energies. Alternate energies can provide capital savings and produce greater self-sufficiency for the country, for communities, for individuals. The nuclear area, however, was never questioned or slashed in the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson).

The nuclear industry has cost the country billions of dollars. Underutilized heavy water plants have had to shut down. Nuclear power plants have been decommissioned at tremendous cost to the taxpayer. However, the Minister of Finance never touched one cent of the money that we continue to pour into the nuclear industry. Surely the Hon. Member must recognize that the balance is leaning toward capital-intensive programs, not programs for alternatives and for appropriate technologies, which would be more beneficial to Canadians in terms of creating jobs and being less capital intensive.

● (1115)

**Mr. Stackhouse:** Mr. Speaker, what the House needs to recognize and the nation needs to appreciate, as I believe most Canadians do, is that the Hon. Member has set up a false dichotomy between capital intensive and labour intensive projects, illustrated by his example of home insulation and

nuclear reactor hydro electric generators. This is not a dispute over ecology and conservation. It really is a matter of providing that adequate technological development take place in our society and in other parts of the world which have a greater need of it, and at the same time of not ignoring the vital human need for useful employment opportunities.

The stark fact in a great part of the world is that their need is for technology and the kind of advance that we have known in the western world. In terms of electrical energy, the fact is that we could have all the conservation and insulation in homes that we could wish, but we would still have a desperate need for electrical power to be generated in sufficient quantity to serve the massive requirements of our society for electrical power. We need both.

Our need is not necessarily for nuclear reactors. They are an alternative. Nonetheless, we need highly technological generative plants. Whether they should be nuclear powered or powered in some other way is another issue altogether. However, we simply cannot maintain the level of life that we have come to enjoy and expect in this country without adequate technological development. That will be as great a human need as the other.

**Mr. de Jong:** Exactly, Mr. Speaker. The question is what type of technological development. Technological development that benefits people, that reduces the cost of production, that is environmentally sound, that has some social use as well, or technological development that is really exploitive? Third World countries cannot afford nuclear reactors. It is a technology that is of very little use to them. What they need is appropriate technologies. Vertical turbines, wind, solar are the types of technologies that make the most sense, not only for Third World countries but for Canada and the rest of the industrialized world.

In his statement, the Minister of Finance goes the road of highly capital intensive megaproject forms of energy generation. He cuts the areas that I believe are our future: appropriate and small scale technologies, such as wind, solar and conservation. A mix of those technologies is the solution to our problem. That is how we will either generate or save more energy than the capital intensive nuclear route.

My criticism of the Government is that it continues along the same path that the Liberals have taken in all these years. It has not struck a new direction. If it cut the nuclear sector and if all the billions of dollars in subsidy that have gone to that sector were directed toward home insulation and alternate energy programs, I suggest to Members opposite that it would create tremendous political goodwill among the men and women of Canada. They would applaud this Government. They would realize that here is a Government with some new ideas, with a sense of new direction, not one that is tied and beholden to the financial interest. Unfortunately, it did not do that. Therefore, we must judge it not on its words and not on its wishes, even though I sympathize with what the Hon. Member is telling us. I think we are saying the same thing. He has to recognize that he is out of step with the wishes of his