Mr. Hawkes: What kind of political courage does it take to stand up and read a researcher speech and say all kinds of pious, wonderful things that are not followed by action? We find as we get a little older—maybe when we were younger we were swayed more easily by words—that one of the characteristics of getting a little older is that you start to look at what people do, not just what they say.

Mr. Kristiansen: You are learning.

Mr. Hawkes: There is the test. What do they do? In the case of the New Democratic Party, I suggest that the whole speech we have heard, of what they would like, is immediately suspect because they did nothing, they moved no amendments.

Mr. Kristiansen: What did the Tories do?

Mr. Hawkes: The NDP moved no amendments, they did not try to change the legislation, so how can they say they want it changed? They did not move for a change. Then you look at the speech of the hon. member and find that he ascribes to the Conservative Party of Canada, and to me in particular, all kinds of things which I supposedly believe in. But look at what I said, Mr. Speaker. Look at what I did, with amendments. You will find that those things ascribed to me are not things I said, they are not things I did, they are simply figments of the imagination of the member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill. When a person says one thing and does another and when he says his opponents said something when they did not, I think one might be well advised to conclude that in the future one should not waste one's time even listening, because someone is trying to do a con job.

• (1700)

Let me repeat in summary for the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill why I think his party and Liberal backbenchers should vote against this legislation at third reading. The decision to run for public office carries with it the responsibility to stand and speak out and vote on issues. Frequently they are difficult, but surely we must have the courage to tell Canadians what we believe reality to be and to act in a fashion consistent with our view of reality.

Those who vote for this piece of legislation are voting to increase the costs of everything Canadians use. Every bit of food coming into their homes, every piece of furniture and every trip Canadians take will cost more if this legislation passes, and the money will be used to buy existing businesses, including service stations. This does not have to be. We are not increasing costs to provide more money for education, health care or other things for which many of us came to this chamber to work. We are not making things cost more so that we can create more jobs. We are simply handing money over to a group of appointed people so that they can go around and buy things like service stations. That is the hard public choice. It can be covered in any way we like, but the reality is there.

What else do we accomplish when we increase those costs? I suggest that every single member of the New Democratic Party and the members of the Liberal Party obtain copies of the transcript of the hearings held in the Standing Committee

Petro-Canada Act

on Energy Legislation this morning because what they will find is that the combination of energy policies of this government, including this Petro-Canada bill, have increased the cost of transportation fuels through taxation. The increase has not been in the real cost of gasoline but in taxation. As a result, our fuel costs are higher than those in the United States of America. We are a big nation with very few people in it, and transportation is very important to our economy. When we want to sell our wheat, our lumber or our manufactured products to other nations, we have to transport them, and in Canada that costs more than it does in the United States because of taxation on fuel. We are losing customers for our wheat, our lumber, products from our mines and our manufactured goods because we have a federal government which taxes fuel oils so heavily that our transportation costs are greater than they are in the United States.

Any Canadian who makes a trip to the United States in the near future can ask someone there about gasoline and heating oil costs, and the truth can be found. Two thirds of the price of transportation fuels and home heating oils in Canada is taxation. Only one third is the cost of the commodity. Two thirds is taxation, and that is a choice the Liberal government is making and the New Democratic Party is supporting. They are saying it is all right that our transportation costs are higher than those of our competitors. When people will not buy our lumber, the products of our mines or our manufactured goods, Canadians will be out of work, and they are out of work now.

We may have difficulty seeing the relationship between \$5.5 billion for Petro-Canada and people being laid off at a mine in northern Ontario or northern Quebec, but there is that relationship. That relationship is caused by the policy of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). It is a relationship supported by the backbenchers of the Liberal Party and by the members of the New Democratic Party. They might laugh at the fact that the Conservative Party of Canada, at its policy convention and in its caucus, goes out of its way to encourage individual members to speak up and to share ideas, facts and information, but in a free society people of good will who work together and share good information are much more likely to reach good decisions.

To play "follow the leader" blindly and myopically without examining the facts is to invite disaster. I suggest that the entire package of energy legislation is a matter of playing "follow the leader" blindly, It is a disaster for this country, and the first building block is an idiotic proposal to increase the cost of everything we consume for the purpose of buying service stations rather than delivering services to people. I urge every member of this chamber to vote against this piece of legislation.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A few moments ago the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie), in a rather spirited oration, got himself into the field of foreign affairs, at which time he said I was replaced by the Tories in the subcommittee on Latin America. I would like to tell the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill, and I ask him to