

*Supply*

has called for royal commissions. They have called for royal commissions into revenue and royal commissions into nuclear energy. We want a royal commission into transportation. We have a royal commission under way on the economy, which could take into account a lot of these questions. I just wonder about the wisdom of having a royal commission on top of royal commission, in views of their related costs.

● (1620)

When there is an issue which needs a direct inquiry or investigation, I would be for that. I have consistently been supportive of this kind of inquiry. When we had riots in our prisons, I was a member of the standing committee which looked into that question. I think we should utilize the time and expertise of Members of this House in looking into these questions, but the last thing we need is to have another royal commission. That is not to say that I exclude all other inquiries or that when a matter is of such magnitude or importance that we cannot have unanimous consent here in the House or in the Government to look into some aspect of a given problem in the country.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Can the Hon. Member tell us whether or not he thinks it is adequate to have legislation which was passed in 1946, some 38 years ago, when the technology has changed so dramatically? This motion is an attempt to join in public debate. If the Hon. Member would go back to October 24, 1979, he would find that the Conservative Government proposed the kind of joint standing committee which I think the Hon. Member would favour, to really look into all aspects of this matter and get back to the House with proposed modern and updated legislation. Would the Hon. Member give his personal commitment to the House to raise in his caucus this week the need for the Government to provide the House with a reference to set up that kind of joint committee? If he does not like royal commissions, will he personally commit himself to pushing inside his caucus the establishment of a joint committee of the House and Senate to move us as quickly as possible into 1984 legislation, technology and understanding of the problem, as we tried to do in 1979 when his Party along with the NDP blocked us?

**Mr. Harquail:** I have no difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the Hon. Member has been here long enough to know that the committee concerned with energy already has the authority to do the work he asks me to support. I have already said I would support any kind of inquiry or good work which might be carried out by the existing committee relating to this question. That committee has the power to look into all aspects of this question at any time it wants to obtain the necessary approval from the House. I suggest to the Hon. Member that he and his colleagues who sit on that committee could make that kind of request so the committee could do the kind of work he is concerned about. He agrees with me on that point.

On the second point, Mr. Speaker, I do not discuss with anyone nor have I ever done so, what goes on in our caucus. I am consistent on that. I will not indicate to him one way or

another whether I will raise that or any other matter before caucus. I will not be telling the Hon. Member or anyone else what we have discussed there or what we will not discuss there.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Order! It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)—Administration of Justice—Official languages—Whether or not Crown attorney in Toronto represented Government policy; the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes)—Labour Conditions—(a) Employment of foreign nationals in universities—(b) Symons Page Report recommendations; the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave)—Western Grain Transportation Act—(a) Rates charges on container shipments of alfalfa pellets (b) Railways' interpretation of Act's provisions.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fulton:

That a Royal Commission of Inquiry be created to study the nuclear fuel cycle in Canada including the range of economic, social, medical, environmental and safety matters resulting from exploration, mining, production, transportation, storage and use of uranium and its byproducts.

**Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this debate on the motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) on the subject of nuclear energy. The motion requests the setting up of a royal commission of inquiry into just about all aspects of nuclear energy. It is certainly a very important issue, worthy of consideration, and we appreciate the opportunity of debating it today in the House. However, I am a little surprised that this subject is perhaps the most important one on the minds of the NDP Members. There are the difficulties with Revenue Canada which affect nearly all Canadians, certainly all tax-paying Canadians. We have our economic problems, unemployment problems and all these other problems, and then we find the NDP willing to use up the whole day on a subject which