

wanted to keep its nuclear weapons options open. The other day the minister stood in the House and said that what the Argentinians had done was crazy. He said that if they had wanted to build a nuclear weapon, they should never have bought a Candu reactor.

On the other side of the coin, the Argentinians seemed convinced that this was the way to travel. There are other authorities who would dispute what the minister said. They would say that probably one of the best investments the Argentinians could make, if they wanted to build a bomb, was in the Candu reactor, especially if Canada was willing to continue to sell the Argentinians uranium to fuel the process. I understand that Argentina is now building two plutonium separators. That is an excellent approach if they want to build a nuclear weapon. Of course, Argentina today is a military dictatorship. It does not have very much concern for the citizens of its own country and is prepared to use military aggression in other parts of the world, and certainly could not be expected to have too much compunction about building a weapon. If that occurs, it will be interesting to see the reaction of hon. members opposite when we have to say again, "We told you so."

• (1940)

Why are we not investing that money in safe, secure sources of alternative energy—not nuclear—and in conservation programs instead? Where did the \$130 million go that we spent to build a bomb for Argentina? It went to making a more dangerous world, one that is not safe and secure for Canadians. That is a very sad commentary on the government's policy. We have here a half-hearted bill regarding the conservation of liquid fuels through more fuel efficiency in the automobile engine and, on the other hand, we are making a tremendous commitment to a very dangerous and insecure source of energy.

It has been pointed out many times that we should be moving toward development alternate energy and conservation as our security for the future and that we should be building up the necessary technology. That will not come about tomorrow. There will be some dislocation and problems with putting it in place, but we are not making the financial commitments necessary to do this. This has been remarked upon by backbenchers in all parties except that the government does not seem to have the commitment to carry it out and in the long run we will all suffer.

The nuclear energy example, dangerous and expensive as it is with its lack of security, is not the only example of an insane policy which is being followed, almost in contradiction of the policies that the party opposite has developed.

The offshore oil and gas seems to be the be-all and end-all for Canadians. As in the nuclear case, it is extremely expensive. We have heard many times in the House about the cost of drilling dry holes in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Labrador. In the committee hearings on Bill C-48 we heard about the cost of drilling holes in the Arctic Ocean and off the coast

of British Columbia. There are enormous costs and enormous risks involved.

Instead of taking the more appropriate approach of guarding and husbanding the resources that we already have in the conventional area and making the conversion as quickly as we can in other areas where we have conventional fields, we are putting all our effort into the development of the frontier and the offshore. This will cost us dearly, Mr. Speaker.

It is amazing to hear Dome Petroleum asking the Japanese to contribute \$400 million in return for one quarter of the oil it discovers—if the Canadian government will rubber-stamp the deal. The Japanese are constructing one of the world's largest icebreaking tankers. That is not for getting oil from Viet Nam, Mr. Speaker; it is for getting it out of the Beaufort Sea. In the past, oil companies have agreed to take the risks if our taxpayers will bear the bulk of the cost and if they are given tax concessions and grants and if the price of the oil is set at what the market will bear. Since there is a glut of oil and the companies need a return on investment and an enhanced cash flow, they expect to export the oil.

It is a vicious circle and an expensive drain on the industrial and economic potential of this country. This is not a secure source of energy; it is expensive and it is extremely dangerous. We saw what happened with the Campeche accident in the Gulf of Mexico. An oil platform broke loose and for months and months it pumped oil into the Caribbean. Yet we are prepared to take risks far greater than were taken at Campeche.

It was interesting to listen to representatives of one of the oil companies who appeared before the committee that was considering Bill C-48. They claimed to have planted a fixture on the bottom of the Arctic Ocean and so they no longer needed the rigs. But what if that should break loose, Mr. Speaker? Would we ever be able to stop the flow? Would we ever be able to deal with it under the ice? We are fooling around with one of the most dangerous and most expensive sources of oil. All our money is going into that and we are ignoring the rational, the safe and the secure future that alternative sources of fuel conservation offer.

Our best course lies with the non-conventional fuels. Tonight the minister said he would put guidelines in place in the first phase with some legislation but that he was not going to bring the second part into force or encourage manufacturers to get serious about fuel efficiency in automobiles. Rather, he seemed to hope that their conscience would dictate the correct course to take.

We have a commitment to back foreign-owned oil companies such as Imperial Oil, Shell Oil, Texaco, Chevron and all those beauties of the past to develop our non-conventional fuel sources. We see them moving into heavy oil development in the Cold Lake project and the Alsands project. We watched them perform with Syncrude. This is a complete repetition of the cycle we have always known when the government chooses this course to be carried out by the multinational oil companies as the major players and as we get into the more expensive options, the more risky options involving large deployment of