The Budget-Mr. Friesen

As for the NDP notion that we are pushing Canadianization of the oil industry for the benefit of those who are already rich, let me repeat what the energy minister said. His department has had talks with credit unions, caisses populaires and wheat pools that want to diversify their investments.

• (2020)

The NDP had a similar argument against extending the MURB program. It is the Multiple Unit Residential Buildings incentive plan that will get the construction industry out of the doldrums. The New Democrats have branded it as merely a tax haven for the rich, and some members of the official opposition have used the same language. This program, like any other, is for those who want to take advantage of it. It will create about 10,000 jobs. It will alleviate the housing shortage in cities like Vancouver where zero vacancy rates have been recorded.

Creating jobs, training workers and developing our economy—we will do it all and at the same time find some answers to our energy problems. This is not the big, bad budget everyone was expecting. We did not de-index personal income tax. We did not raise those taxes or corporate taxes. Registered Home Ownership Savings Plans are still available. There is a whole raft of things we were expected to do but they would have been contrary to our Liberal philosophy. We are encouraging business but we are not going to let multinational oil companies continue to take us to the cleaners. This is a many-faceted budget which looks far into the future. It makes that future look very bright for all Canadians, no matter where they live—east, west, north or south. This is a budget of which we can all be proud.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, it is customary for members to begin a speech of this nature by saying it is a pleasure to rise and speak on the subject before them. I must say that when I look at this budget I can hardly say it is a pleasure to speak on it. I listened with some attention to the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. McCauley) who has been sharing his views with regard to the budget and the reaction to it. He kept referring to what he called the irresponsible criticism of the opposition.

Anticipating that kind of reaction on the part of the government I thought I would go to the newspapers of the land and look at the headlines the day after the budget had been laid before us in the House. These newspapers are really not promoters of the Tory party so I think that may serve to make their comments a little more objective. One newspaper says the budget is the "Biggest move since Second World War" and "Energy policy is massive nationalist intervention". One columnist says: "Mackenzie King lurks in MacEachen budget". I do not think that headline would be thought to be too complimentary. Another one in the Gazette says of the budget: "Taxing the energy firms a curve ball to the taxpayer". Geoff Stevens talks about "The cunning of MacEachen". Another columnist talks about "New natural gas levy slap in the face for the west". Another one said, "Budget worse than appears". "Slick and sly MacEachen left 'em gasping", says one newspaper, while another says it was "Imprudent, insulting". Finally, one columnist said, "Tone of reason is deceptive".

The two adjectives which I found sadly missing in the descriptions of the budget in the national press were "good" and "honest". Nowhere does the press say it was an honest budget designed to meet the needs of Canadians. As a result, we have a budget which evokes those epithets thrown at the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and we see a reaction which cultivates cynicism in the land and distrust of the government by the public. And we do not need any more of that.

I noted with interest that the hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) rose in his place last Wednesday during the question period and put a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) in which he was throwing back to the minister the line the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) uses all the time about the need to be sharing in Canada.

An hon. Member: Redistributing the wealth.

Mr. Friesen: Redistributing the wealth, the hon. member says. I would like to ask the hon. member for Longueuil to examine the concept of federalism in the way the government defines "sharing". In his question he was asking about investment in Quebec. But the Prime Minister has always talked about sharing the energy resources of the west with the rest of the country.

And since we are talking about those kinds of investments I would like to ask the hon. member if he has asked about the way Quebec Hydro shares the wealth it gets from the investment that Newfoundland has made in the development of hydro electric energy Quebec sells it to the United States. I understand that the contract the province of Quebec has with the province of Newfoundland is somewhere in the range of a 65-year contract. It was made by the former premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Smallwood, because he could not get a better deal with Quebec. He had to sell that energy at fire sale prices to the province of Quebec which in turn, having no investment in the project at all and being nothing but a broker, re-sells that energy to New York State at world prices. And that is a 65-year contract. I ask you: is that sharing?

I am wondering about sharing in terms of Ontario's gold mines. I know that the energy resources in Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia are attractive because the value is now inflated because of petro-dollars, but so is the price of gold. Just a few years ago gold was valued at \$35 an ounce and now it is valued at between \$600 and \$700 an ounce. I would say the price of gold has been inflated. What about the price of gold and its value to the province of Ontario? Since Ontario and the federal government want Alberta to sell their oil to the rest of the country at one-half the world price I wonder if the province of Ontario would sell its gold or its uranium at half the world price.

I am wondering about the protective tariffs and the quota system which is in effect. It has been here for the past hundred years and people across Canada have accepted it. It was put in