

Taxation

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know the hon. member would not want to mislead the House intentionally, but the fact is that his party has voted with the Liberals twice as many times as the NDP. Every time he makes this statement, we are going to rise on points of order and point that out.

Mr. Siddon: Why are you so sensitive?

Mr. Waddell: Who is in bed with whom? Get the record straight.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I am not really sure what the hon. member has said.

Mr. Blackburn: Check the voting record.

Mr. Gurbin: Obviously something has happened to upset him. It is not unusual that we cannot understand what members of the New Democratic Party say because they change their minds so often. They have done so in relation to the Constitution and in relation to energy prices. Just the other day I heard the hon. member say he finally understood what was happening in relation to the cash flow problems of small independents. It is about time members of the New Democratic Party understood some of the things happening in the oil industry. It is a little late, however, for the oil rigs which have left the country. It is a little late to make up for lost production. We could have had that production, and that would have helped to make us secure and self-sufficient in energy. Because of the single-mindedness of the NDP and the Liberals, they want centralized control. They want to take away from the industry the cash flows it needs to be competitive and to undertake the development necessary to achieve the production levels we need.

Even if I am not absolutely correct, I must be somewhat correct because I am upsetting members of the New Democratic Party. When they are upset, that usually means we are on the right track.

Mr. Kristiansen: Just go back behind the bushes.

Mr. Siddon: Saskatchewan haunts them a little bit.

Mr. Blackburn: Check the voting record.

Mr. Gurbin: There is obviously a difference of opinion about energy self-sufficiency and how we will achieve the goal which has been stated by all parties. The previous national government made a major effort to bring about energy self-sufficiency. Canada has the ability to produce synthetic petroleum products, and if we did that, we would be self-sufficient. That would take us out of the international scene, where we are vulnerable to developments over which we have no control. We should be developing our own resources and generating the employment, the income and all the industrial activity we need not only in the west but also in Ontario and other parts of the country. Progress toward that goal of energy self-sufficiency has been stopped.

When hon. members opposite talk about the goal of energy self-sufficiency, they point with pride to their conservation

efforts. I was struck by one specific point the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) made in committee several weeks ago. He was talking about how well recognized the Canadian conservation program is at the International Energy Agency. Two years ago I was at the International Energy Agency in France, and it was agreed that Canada seemed to be coming along with its conservation program. I was also told that was appropriate because we had previously had the worst conservation record. That was in 1979 and 1980. We had been wasting energy for so long that our record was among the worst of all the nations which are part of the International Energy Agency. Indeed, we need a comprehensive and effective conservation program, and now we are getting some parts of such a program.

On the other side of the coin we have CHIP. CHIP was improved recently, and that was applauded by members of all parties, including members of the NDP, who are often on the wrong track. In this case they might have the right idea. However, I honestly question whether including CHIP is fair. The government brought in the National Energy Program in November, 1980 but surely they cannot expect the official opposition to believe that the CHIP program is the National Energy Program or a major part of it. CHIP has been an important part of conservation in Canada since at least 1975. It is a good program which we have supported and will continue to support, but surely the government would not expect Canadians to believe that the National Energy Program was responsible for CHIP. It was in effect a long time before the National Energy Program.

● (1550)

I have heard the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola) speak with pride in this House about the nuclear program in Canada. The major part of our nuclear program falls to Ontario Hydro and it has been in effect since at least 1965. Even before that, the groundwork was laid for a 250 megawatt plant by John Diefenbaker and John Robarts. In face of the failures of Alsands, of Cold Lake, the Alaska pipeline and now perhaps the pipeline from Quebec to Halifax, would the government have the Canadian people believe that nuclear energy is part of their National Energy Program? That is a contention of dubious honesty, Mr. Speaker.

Self-sufficiency is our common goal, Mr. Speaker. It will not be achieved, however, if oil rigs and investment continue to leave the country. The industry lacks the confidence to do the things that need to be done. It looks as if by 1990 we will be exactly where we are stuck now, having to import between 20 and 30 per cent of our petroleum requirements. It is unfortunate that we will continue to be in that vulnerable position until beyond 1990. Things could change if steps were taken to improve the investment climate in this country instead of the kind of actions that are identified with all the different parts of the National Energy Program.