

hydro, energy conservation and unconventional alternatives such as solar, wind and so on. However, Mr. Speaker, we must stop and consider the benefits of such projects as I have mentioned, such as the construction of Lepreau II in New Brunswick, where we will see millions of dollars expended during the construction stage, creating thousands of person-years of employment.

The motion before us today, as I said earlier, does not seem to be linked at all to the reality of what we are attempting to do in Canada. Not too long ago, when I was speaking in the House, I talked about forestry and the creation of jobs in that important sector or our economy. I spoke about the need for the New Brunswick Electric plants such as CIP, and others which might be having difficulty, a break on their power rates. One of the reasons I put that suggestion on the floor of the House, and submitted the recommendation to the Premier of that province and to his Cabinet, to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister responsible for labour in that province, was to focus on the fact that since the federal Government has transferred funds to assist that province in the initial stages of the construction of the Lepreau plant, and in many other ways through transfer of funds from Ottawa and through funds we have allocated through DREE, it should now hold good to its word and position and assist these plants which are having difficult times in international markets and give them a break on their power rates to help them through this difficult period.

It is because of that very positive position we have taken, Mr. Speaker, in assisting provinces such as New Brunswick, putting them in the position of being able to produce a reasonable economically-priced source of power supply, that I would ask the Province at the same time to consider the well-being and welfare of some of its plants by giving them some relief on power rates.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that energy is important to our economy now. It will be even more so in the future. If the Canadian industry is to compete with foreign suppliers in the world market, and even in our own market, it must be highly productive. That will take energy. To an increasing extent, it will take electrical energy. I am not suggesting that our utilities should dash out and build all sorts of new generating plants. I am saying that if we want to ensure that we can supply low-cost electricity in the future when the economy requires it, we must make sure that we do not make a shortsighted decision now which could tie our hands in the future. We have a remarkably successful electrical supply system in Canada. We have taken the right steps. We know of the successes, and the kind of money which has come into our economy through the sale of this technology to other countries in the world.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, obviously, as is evident from what I have said, I am totally opposed to the motion which is before the House today.

Mr. Kristiansen: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of comments and one or two questions. I really have to ask whether the Hon. Member opposite who just spoke read the motion which

Supply

the New Democratic Party has placed before the House. It reads, and I quote:

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.

Contrary to some of the statements which were made, we have not openly prejudged the entire issue. That is why we are asking for a royal commission, unlike that former Prime Minister, Mackenzie King, who was known for piling parliamentary committee upon royal commission, such as the Government has done by having a commission on Canada's economic prospects on top of another one held a few years ago, and having some of its Ministers ask for new investigations of foreign investment in Canada after we had a study a few years earlier. Government has done the same thing on numerous other topics. However, we have difficulty getting the truth from the nuclear industry when we ask them any questions, and even when the Government asks them questions.

There is no more appropriate a commission that this country should have in order to satisfy the many serious questions which reside not only in the minds of Hon. Members of the House of Commons, but in the minds of the people in our constituencies from one end of the country to the other. Seldom have we had an industry which has piled up expenditure upon deficit in every realm of its activities, from subsidy for exploration right through to selling the product overseas and payola to foreign agents, as has the nuclear industry. It needs an investigation from top to bottom more than any other single industry in Canada.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, it was very difficult through the political speech of the Hon. Member for Kootenay West to understand what his question was. He might have saved that for a New Democratic rally. I could not recognize any specific question which he had on his mind.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Restigouche. I understand, and indeed share, some of his reservations about a royal commission. However, I wonder if we are to interpret his remarks as excluding the advisability of having either a special House committee or special joint committee of the House and Senate from examining the issue? It seems to me the Minister himself indicated what was, in his view, a certain amount of misinformation in the public domain about the particular issue and, indeed, the legitimate concern in the public domain. Am I doing my colleague an injustice by interpreting his remarks to mean that he might oppose that type of examination of the issue?

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Perth for giving me the opportunity to clarify my remarks. When I said that I was opposed to the contents of the motion of the New Democratic Party today, it is because I do not believe that what we need in this country are more commissions. I do not see any great salvation or satisfaction in just having royal commissions. It seems that in recent months not only the New Democratic Party but the Official Opposition