

all of the environmental damage costs were added up. On economic grounds alone we would not be in favour of this industry. I refer to Wollaston Lake as only the latest in a long list of horrors along this line.

Let me quote the Inter-Church Uranium Committee from Saskatchewan and Ploughshares Saskatoon. They say:

Eldorado Nuclear wants to build three new uranium mines in and underneath Wollaston Lake, a huge and magnificent lake in northern Saskatchewan and a valuable commercial fishery source. One of these mines . . . is to be constructed 230 yards out into Wollaston Lake where waters are currently 45 feet deep. It is difficult to believe Eldorado's claim that Wollaston Lake will not be permanently scarred and polluted.

I find it difficult to believe that as well and I find it difficult to understand why those kinds of questions do not occupy the Government's mind when it considers the issue of what is going to happen.

We have been told that uranium is safe, cheap power. I would like to contest both those aspects of the Government's argument. With regard to the safety, we do not have an adequate accounting of the health costs. Estimates have been made by Dr. Rosalie Bertell, a world acknowledged expert on this, who counts the premature death world-wide from low-level radiation in the millions. When you infer estimates from the epidemiological studies, there are millions of people who are affected in some place or another from the mining, processing, transportation, and disposal.

It is not safe and it is not cheap. There has been no adequate accounting of the disposal costs. What will it cost to pay one night watchman to guard an area for 300,000 years, which is the half-life of some of the radioactive isotopes in the waste which must be disposed of from this immensely dangerous product? It is arrogant of people to suggest that we have a solution around the corner.

A solution around the corner for waste disposal which can take 300,000 years? How can we be sure that there will not be an earthquake or some other kind of environmental disaster for 300,000 years? Whatever the safe disposal mechanism is which might last for 50 years, we cannot be sure that there will not be erosion and seepage of the radioactive wastes into the rivers and drinking water systems of people who may live far away from, let alone near to, those sites.

How many sites are there going to be? We already have enough on our hands now. If we continue and expand this industry, as is the Government's intention, there will be even more. We have not even been able to solve the problem for the wastes we have at the present and it is arrogant to suggest that we can handle even more of it in the future, that we can find even more waste disposal sites which will be safe.

There are implications for the uranium question in the Mulroney-Reagan trade giveaway. The Government tried to seek more access for Canadian uranium to the United States because in the past there have been American politics and American supply questions which have meant that our uranium sales have been curtailed. Canada gave away the

requirements to process in Canada in order to ensure access to American markets. This decision was made without any consideration for the environmental consequences.

The Government agrees with the principles of the Brundtland report on integrating the economy and the environment in decision-making and then signs this trade deal, one of the elements of which is to expand uranium as an energy source and to look for new markets for uranium without having solved the problems which we already have. I consider that to be enormously irresponsible.

Canada produces 19 per cent of the uranium in the world's market. It is the greatest producer and the greatest exporter in the world. We like to think of ourselves as being environmentally conscious and as peacemakers in the world, yet we allow proliferation and allow our uranium to be used for military purposes so long as it is done by the back door and not the front door.

We are now seeking even more markets for our uranium without any greater safeguards. The domestic uses themselves are equally as dangerous. I am not objecting only to the military uses by any means. The health consequences and the environmental damage happen irrespective of the ultimate use, whether for weapons or the production of electricity.

I would like to close by referring to the fact that we do have alternatives. In terms of job creation, these are not good jobs. It is a capital intensive industry so not many jobs are produced, and there is a great deal of danger. We should be seeking alternatives for the people who work in this industry. In the case of energy production, which is enormously important for our economy, we should be seeking other forms of energy. We should be developing renewable sources of energy. We should be looking at energy which does not pollute. We should be putting our research and development money into creating an energy future that will be safe, cheap and will provide jobs for Canadians. We do have options.

• (1730)

The Bill before us today is an extremely misguided measure which I hope this House will defeat. I hope at this first stage that Members at least will support the six month's hoist. I hope they will take another look at the whole question of our nuclear future.

Mr. Skelly: Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on her excellent speech. Hopefully, the Government will see the wisdom of her remarks and withdraw the Bill.

One of the most dangerous aspects the Hon. Member pointed to during her speech was, of course, the use of the products in the nuclear cycle which produce weapons. I wonder if she would elaborate a little more on the dangers of that particular aspect and Canada's role in exporting that material.

The other area is the area of occupational health and safety which is extremely important to the people who live and work