

more than a pittance on mine safety equipment and which had a wilful ignorance of study after study proving that uranium miners were being ravaged by cancer and lung disease. The article went on to state that only after one of Canada's most bitter wildcat strikes in 1974 and a subsequent royal commission that publicly vindicated the health and safety experts, did Mr. Roman and his company, Denison Mines Limited, install safety equipment.

That is rather a damning indictment of Roman and Denison Mines. Mr. Roman, the great free enterprise buccaneer, of course got most of his money in the development of Denison Mines from hand-outs from Eldorado Nuclear and guarantees from the Government's Eldorado Nuclear.

The Government is now prepared to sell Eldorado Nuclear without including the entire environmental responsibility and the enormous debt. The environmental difficulties do not end with dump sites. There are further problems in Port Hope and in Saskatchewan mine mills. Continued operation of the Port Hope facility, especially at the present high rates of production—9,000 tonnes of UF₆ annually—will generate considerable levels of solid and liquid waste. With the proximity of the plant to both Lake Ontario and the townsite, the new company would do its image a great deal of good by committing itself to efforts to recycle or clean up and sell all such wastes. No mention has been made of such an approach.

• (1640)

Clean-up problems also exist in the mills in Saskatchewan. The tailings that are produced contain small amounts of uranium, radium and other elements. Very good effluent treatment is required on an ongoing basis and a thorough understanding of the principles involved have to be taught to the personnel involved. Historically, such understanding has been suspect at best. These are problems the Government is not really acknowledging.

It seems to me it is too early to privatize Eldorado Nuclear. We need a full government inquiry into the nuclear industry and what is happening in the nuclear industry and how we can deal with some of these environmental problems such as the disposal of high level and low level nuclear waste with which Eldorado Nuclear is so involved. So I think it is too early to privatize Eldorado Nuclear. I also think the Government has taken too much of the responsibility for the debts and for the immense environmental problems.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House my speech of December 1, 1986. I tried to deal with some of the principles of privatization in that speech. I pointed out that the Government's privatization campaign, as I saw it, was not a response to public pressure. I said, as reported at page 1626 of *Hansard*:

Rather, it seems to stem from a neo-Conservative ideology which I think is at odds with Canada's history. Crown corporations go back to the construction of the Lachine Canal in 1921. That was our first public enterprise and it was undertaken by the Government of Lower Canada when a private firm involved failed. We have seen the same pattern throughout Canadian history. Our

Eldorado Nuclear Limited

Crown corporations have been a binding force for a small population in this vast country which is next door to the most powerful country in the world. We have had our reasons for Crown corporations. They have been justified by the need to provide essential services, develop national resources, operate public utilities, bail out private sector firms, or pioneer in new fields.

They were established not only for a public presence but also a Canadian presence in areas where the Americans might well have otherwise stepped in.

We in the New Democratic Party believe there must be, then, reasons for privatizing the Crown corporations, given that they have a role to play in Canadian history. There have been public opinion polls taken on this issue. Those polls show that most people want to keep Crown corporations except for one group, those who earn over \$55,000 a year. The rich want to sell the Crown corporations. I suspect it is because they would like to buy them so they can benefit by picking up these jewels that Canada owns. It is a phoney question to ask if we would not want the workers to own it. The workers already own it. We all own it, collectively. There is room for the workers to become more involved by getting them on the board of directors and having them involved in the health and safety aspects of the enterprise, particularly in the uranium industry. The steel workers have made great improvements there and are still fighting to make better improvements.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House a paper prepared by Professor John Langford for the Institute for Research and Public Policy at a conference a couple of years ago on privatization. Professor Langford is a professor of public administration at the University of Victoria. He attempted to analyse the reasons for advocating privatization. He said one belief is that privatization will remove the state enterprise threat to the mixed economy. The premise is that Governments now own too much of the economy. How much state enterprise in some industrial sectors is significant or insignificant? He said the fact is that state enterprise accounts for only about 12 per cent of the economic activity in Canada. That is not out of line with the situation prevailing in a number of other successful industrialized countries.

That refutes the argument that there is too much state enterprise. Another reason given in support of privatization is that it will create new jobs, new investment, a renewed economy, and a rationalized private sector. While that may sound promising, I am wondering about the historical evidence in this area. The Hon. Member from Sarnia told us of an experience he had. I can speak about my experience from British Columbia. The former Premier, Bill Bennett, privatized many of the Crown corporations in British Columbia in one lump. It was called the British Columbia Resources Investment Corporation. People bought shares for \$6 a share. They now sell at less than a \$1 a share. That privatization scheme was a disaster and some investors are still paying for it. It did not particularly create any jobs.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) once said: "I have yet to see a takeover that created a single job except for lawyers and accountants". Privatization could be spoken of in the same way and it could simply lead to further corporate concentration. Privatization does not necessarily create jobs. It has to be