

Energy Administration Act

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. If there was any doubt in Your Honour's mind prior to the last expressions used by the hon. gentleman, surely that doubt must now have been dissipated. The hon. gentleman has been in this House since 1972. I have observed him since that time—

Mr. Andre: And learned nothing.

Mr. Blais:—and the accusations he is making are made as if he were looking into a looking glass. I have heard him use hyperbole of the worst kind with the precise view in mind of exciting in western Canada the kind of behaviour which resulted in the meeting which took place last evening.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Dingwall) informed me—and I hope I am not breaking a confidence—that there would be only one speaker for the Liberal party on this bill. There seems to be some pent-up need on the part of others to participate, and I welcome their participation. If the minister would like to give a speech on this bill, I hope he will read the bill first because, if he did, he might be a little less critical of the remarks I have been making. He would be less critical if he was aware of the issues. However, if he feels a need to speak, I certainly hope he takes advantage of the opportunity the House of Commons provides. If he feels his speech would contribute to a reduction in the feelings of frustration, anger and rage which cause people in the hundreds and thousands in western Canada to look at separatism as an answer, and if he can allay their concerns and cause those meetings to decrease in number, then I would welcome that speech. I sincerely would, but I am afraid that is not likely to occur.

So far the only answer from the government is an advertising campaign which brings more people out to such meetings. They know why they are angry, and when they see ads on television with geese flying into the sunset and the government saying "We have to inform you", the implication is: "Look, you dummies out there, you don't know what is going on. If you watch these ads, they will make you know what is going on, and then you won't want to join the WCC." The \$70 million the government is spending on advertising is not just money down the drain; it is contributing to the membership of the WCC, but the government does not seem to understand.

There were marvellous promises made. There was no way the party opposite would allow an 18 cents tax increase. Hon. members opposite said: "Vote Liberal and we will keep the price of gasoline down". Vote Liberal and pay more than \$2 a gallon for gasoline. We pay \$1.35 in taxes alone. We have to listen to the minister say he is keeping our prices below the world level. What do we have to do to get a minister to tell us

the truth? Can we expect truth out of our national government?

Mr. Kelly: Can we expect it from you, Harvie?

Mr. Andre: This is what causes people to think that perhaps the WCC is the only alternative, and that is the tragedy.

Mr. Kelly: Get out of the gutter.

Mr. Andre: Let me tell hon. members about the competence of this government which fills us full of hope. Item two of the long list of taxes attached to this bill is a transportation fuel recovery charge. Let us remember that all this is to help Canadian consumers! Canadian consumers are going to pay less than world price! Let me read from the Vancouver *Province* of Sunday, April 11, 1982:

A special tax imposed by the federal government on diesel oil burned by Canadian ships engaged in international trade has raised the cost of fuel well above the prevailing U.S. price, the Council of Marine Carriers claims.

I suppose that is propaganda designed to enrage and inflame feelings of separatism, according to the hon. member who was mouthing off and is now silent. I suppose that is what that is all about. We are protected from the world price unless, of course, we happen to drive cars and need gasoline or if we happen to have ships which burn diesel fuel.

Mr. Kelly: This garbage passes for insight out west, but not here.

Mr. Andre: I referred to automobiles and ships. What about aircraft? Let us see what the geniuses and marvellous people who bring us "cheap energy" are doing in relation to aircraft fuel. According to the *Edmonton Journal* of April 11, 1982:

Canadian airline and oil industry officials are shaking their heads in disbelief at a complex new fuel tax system now being proposed by the federal government.

A direct tax on aviation fuel used for international flights has been withdrawn following complaints by other countries that the tax violated bilateral air agreements.

What we are asked to approve in Bill C-103 is a tax the government cannot impose because it violates International Air Transport Association agreements. However, the government has collected it, so we now have to pass a law to legalize a tax collected previously which the government was not allowed to collect. Can hon. members believe that? And the government says "Vote for us and we will keep prices down"!

Let me quote from this article again:

"I think they (federal officials) are out of their minds," said Gordon Lindsay of the Air Transport Association of Canada.

"This is the most complex thing I've ever seen pulled on a tax."

The article goes on with equally complimentary comments about the competence of this government, to which those—to use the description of the Prime Minister—"trained donkeys" say, "Aye, sir, aye, we approve; we think you are wonderful and doing just a great job."

Mr. Smith: Thanks, Harv.

Mr. Cousineau: Don't be so generous.