

Supply

other important economic spin-offs that have accrued to Canada. From time to time one must wonder about the policies and the existence of this splinter Party in our system when motions such as the one before us today are set down on the Order Paper.

● (1600)

I shall certainly be saying some positive things about nuclear energy as it relates to Atlantic Canada and New Brunswick in particular. Today we heard the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) and Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) speak on the subject. The Hon. Member for Regina East was yelling at the top of his voice this morning, saying he is totally opposed to this. He was attempting to put fear into the minds of the people in Canada. Using such scare tactics, he would have people taking a negative view of this kind of energy.

Let me put the federal Government's clear and straightforward position on record regarding nuclear power in Canada from the environmental point of view and regarding the peacetime use of radioactive materials. We do not close our eyes to the realities of life as the NDP does from time to time, nor to the advances of technology and the increasing understanding of the dangers and the benefits of this type of energy. We have a clear and workable position that enables Canadians to receive the benefits and to heed the warning signs. We take into consideration the public's concerns and rights as well as industrial needs and economic international pressures. Our position is that all activities and technologies connected with the development and production of such nuclear power, the production and sale of radioactive materials or the management and ultimate disposal of resulting waste products, should be regulated in an open and consistent manner by the federal authority that extends in partially to all parts of the country.

It is our position that those regulations must take full account of the environmental factors, both short term and long term, no matter what aspect of the environment, living or non-living or human, is involved. I am glad that in these debates we have an opportunity to set the record straight and to make some points that need to be made when a motion such as this is brought before the House.

Every energy source must be judged in terms of its contribution toward meeting Canada's energy needs and in comparison with other possible ways of achieving the same goal. Nuclear energy is no exception. We know that in the Maritimes, certainly in New Brunswick, much money has been spent by the province and by the federal Government to construct the Lepreau plant. Plans are well advanced for the construction of Lepreau II, in the not too distant future. In a recent Canadian Broadcasting Corporation program, a professor of economics from the University of New Brunswick used that project as one of the indicators that a boom could take place in the economy of that province and its neighbouring provinces, should it be constructed within a reasonable period of time. Over \$1 billion was spent on the construction of Lepreau I and now it is in full production. The potential for sales to the

United States is great enough to satisfy the planners that they should approve the expenditure for Lepreau II.

This is taking place at a time of international crisis in the economy and a time when people are crying about high unemployment, Mr. Speaker. It would seem to be a good time to consider the ways and means of continuing with this kind of development. Those people who hold themselves out as the sole protectors of the worker and who seem to have taken that divine right upon themselves, ask for a royal commission and also ask, as did one Member from Ontario, that we shut down the Ontario plant and put all those people out of work, and that we not consider future plant construction. If the central elements of the motion before the House were adopted, it would have the effect of putting 36,000 Canadians out of work.

It has to be one of the greatest contradictions in the history of this country when men and women elected to a political Party that holds itself to be the saviour of the worker and which believes that it alone speaks for the Canadian Labour Congress—which we know is totally inaccurate—take such a position. By taking direct, positive action in constructing these plants to produce this important fuel, we are doing what we told the Canadian people we would do, that is, create jobs. I wonder what the New Democratic Party would tell the Energy Chemical Workers' Union of Canada? What they propose would put people out on the street, people who, through no fault of their own, are unable to find meaningful permanent employment.

The other important issue in the debate is the whole question of conservation and trying to become self sufficient in energy in Canada. We cannot do that without taking advantage of and advancing the controlled use of nuclear energy in our time.

● (1610)

Uranium burned in Candu reactors provides a safe, reliable and clean alternative for generating electricity. It is already economical in those parts of the country which have begun to exhaust low-cost hydro resources and do not have access to low-cost coal. It will become increasingly attractive in other parts of the country in the future. Nuclear energy is a resource that is high in Canadian content. It provides employment to a highly skilled work force and represents a symbol of Canadian technological excellence, the like of which we have not seen to date.

The problems of the industry are manageable and the benefits of generating electricity using this indigenous Canadian technology and resource outweighs the risks. Neither this energy source nor any other energy source can be judged in a vacuum. It must be judged first in terms of its potential contribution to the supply of energy necessary to support our industrial economy and to maintain and increase our standard of living, and, second, in relation to other possible ways of achieving the same goal. In the case of uranium, the goal in domestic energy supply is the production of a reliable and economical supply of electricity. The alternatives are coal,