

*Oral Questions*

and credible report. He asks for examples. I remind him that when the report on bilingual air traffic control was submitted to the Conservative government, that government took a decision, accepted the recommendations, and worked toward the implementation of that report in consultation with the aviation industry. Surely the minister cannot hide behind that. Is he suggesting for one minute that it is the practice of his government to establish another inquiry to study the recommendations of a public inquiry which has conducted countless hours of study and examination, with the support of all segments of the aviation industry? The minister has not even included the aviation industry in the implementation of that report.

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I can only repeat what I have said. Indeed, the government of the time accepted the Chouinard report. The subject matter had been extensively discussed. The previous government had done much of the preliminary work. I can understand that there will be reports on occasions which will come to conclusions which everyone will accept at one particular time, but that is certainly not the standard practice.

The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East has for nine sessions, I understand, had a bill on the Order Paper on the same subject as the Dubin report respecting investigation of accidents. The least we can do is compare the hon. member's bill with the Dubin report to see if there are not features which could be borrowed one from the other.

This indiscriminate approach to a report, regardless of how good it is—and I have said how good it is—surprises me very much. I do not think the hon. member will find many precedents in the past for such a slavish attitude with respect to a report, however good it is.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

## NUCLEAR ENERGY

### REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF REPORT

**Mr. Mark Rose (Mission-Port Moody):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and it relates to a rather furtive in-house study of atomic energy initiated by the government which, of course, was paid for, as usual, by the public. I understand it is now complete. When will it be made public?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, there are all kinds of studies and papers being worked on in my department on many subjects. I indicated a long while ago that we were reviewing the nuclear question. This review is still in progress. If and when a statement is required, a statement will be made, together with the publication of whatever papers are appropriate. Indeed, I intend to release a number of papers, but they are not ready for release or publication as yet. Many are still being reviewed

internally. Once that internal review is completed and the papers are ready for publication, I will be very happy to make them available.

**Mr. Rose:** Madam Speaker, the minister well knows that this report, which is the result of what was proposed by the official opposition to be a public study—it was called for and supported by my party as a public study—is of consuming interest to the general public, and this business of partially completing it and sending it directly to Atomic Energy of Canada is not acceptable. Will the minister assure the House that this report will be public and that it will not be hidden like a great number of other documents have been hidden by this government, especially those relating to the uranium industry?

**Mr. Lalonde:** Madam Speaker, this subject is of consuming interest to me too, and I am very interested in making as much information public as possible. As I said, once the studies are ready for publication, I will be very happy to make them available.

[*Translation*]

REFERENCE TO PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-West):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

[*English*]

Madam Speaker, I have a very serious supplementary question respecting this inquiry which has been going on for many, many months. In fact it has gone on for over a year. When I questioned the minister earlier, he indicated that the studies and the subject matter would be referred to a parliamentary committee or a task force, for consideration of the total question of nuclear policy in Canada and externally, or some segments of it. Is the minister still of the opinion that that matter should be referred to a special parliamentary committee so that parliamentarians may have some input?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, I must refer my colleague to the previous answer I gave on that subject. I told him that it seemed to be an issue of great interest to the general public and to parliamentarians as well, and that the use of a specific parliamentary mechanism, either the formula of a task force or a parliamentary committee did indeed deserve very serious consideration. Once again, I refer him to my previous statement.

Therefore, when the documents are made public the government will announce the formula it deems most advantageous to launch that study. What will be the exact formula? The cabinet has not yet reached a decision on that question.