

My colleagues who speak in absolutes all the time are giving me a slightly hard time here. But there is an area in which we make human judgments as well.

Mr. Blenkarn: I want to know whether you are opposed to nuclear energy, and if you are, say so.

Mr. Ogle: May I ask for the Hon. Member's second question again, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Member spoke he indicated that there was no opportunity for people from the outside to visit the Key Lake spill. Is he aware that the provincial Member, Mr. Fred Thompson, actually visited the site of the Key Lake spill and indicated that there was no need for an inquiry as a result of that visit?

Mr. Ogle: That is an extremely good question, Mr. Speaker. I was aware the Member had said that. Because the people who work at the mine are almost all from Saskatoon, I am very interested in it myself. I hope to visit the site, probably this week. I have been told that I cannot bring any press people with me, and that bothers me. If there is no problem, I do not see why the matter cannot be disclosed and opened up. This is what we are talking about, having a complete and open study of the situation. I do not think anyone should be afraid of the truth. We should know the facts, and all Canadians have to be aware of those factors in order to make those decisions that we or someone else has to make about the future.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I have a series of three questions. Can the Hon. Member indicate why in 1979 his Party effectively blocked the formation of a committee to inquire into not only the things mentioned in today's motion but something much broader? Can he indicate why he prefers a royal commission to some kind of a joint House of Commons-Senate joint committee of inquiry? Can he tell the House why the exploration issue is not covered by the motion? Is the New Democratic Party not concerned about the exploration of this kind of technology around the world?

Mr. Ogle: First I will try to answer the questions with the knowledge I have, Mr. Speaker. It has been mentioned twice. I appreciate the fact that a committee was being set up and that the House did not last long enough for it to continue in 1979. I know of no reason why we blocked it except that the terms of reference perhaps were not broad enough at the time. If it was blocked, I cannot remember who did that.

The royal commission is an approach. We introduced the notion of a royal commission because of the broader terms we felt could have been brought in to study the whole institutional process. We felt the whole thing could be done better under that kind of a group. If there were any group moving at all in this areas, we would be happy, whether it were a committee, a royal commission, or anything at all, that someone was doing a serious study of the whole process from beginning to end. Exportation naturally is a very important part of the whole cycle. I hope anybody who wants to will speak to that. I asked

Supply

several questions about that of the Minister and of other people this morning. I, too, believe that proliferation, the spreading around of the technology as well as the material itself, is something that I do not think is guarded carefully enough. I believe some of the sales that have been made, to help the Atomic Energy Commission along, I think have not been well studied from their moral point of view. I would be very happy to hear the opinions of everybody on this whole question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): That concludes the ten minutes for questions and comments. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Blaker).

Mr. Blaker: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the House and you yourself permit me to pursue a point of order only as a courtesy in that I have not been able to speak for the last four years while I occupied the same position that you do now? This is the first chance that I have had to do so. I would like to express to all Hon. Members my great appreciation and the honour I felt in serving this House in the position that you hold. At the same time I want to take the opportunity to wish Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Acting Speaker, Mr. Guilbault, and yourself as my neighbouring Member of Parliament in Montreal, the very best in your new positions. I thank all Hon. Members for the opportunity that I had to serve.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The kind remarks are appreciated even though they are not a point of order.

The Hon. Member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail).

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that the Hon. Member who just addressed the House expressed good wishes, just as I want to do since it is my first opportunity to express my sincere congratulations to you in your new responsibilities and to wish you well. At the same time I would like to put on the record my best wishes to the new Speaker, His Honour, the Deputy Speaker and your colleague, the Acting Speaker, Mr. Guilbault.

Today we have an Opposition Day in which a motion was put forward calling for yet another royal commission. It seems that there has been a run on royal commissions in recent years or at least in calls for them. Today, members of the New Democratic Party have completely missed an opportunity to bring forward a subject that would be more germane to the problems in the country today such as employment, a subject that they tell the Canadian people is so important to them. Today, Member after Member in that Party has spoken as if he lived in another country, if not in another world. It certainly is not realistic for them to attempt to put forward the position they have taken of totally opposing the use of nuclear fuel energy in this country. Surely the positive effects and economic benefits derived by all Canadians since the development of this important fuel have not gone unnoticed, nor have all the