

Taxation

and the taxes being levied before they have had legislative approval. It is criminal that the country has reached the stage where the government goes ahead and levies taxes without the authority of Parliament, and then it expects other people in the country to obey the laws.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, would the House allow unanimous consent for the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) to answer a brief question before the next speaker is recognized?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's allotted time has expired. This would require unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Anguish: Would the hon. member give us a brief explanation as to what the view of Liberal premiers in Canada would be on the topic we are discussing this evening?

Mr. Paproski: What Liberal premiers?

Mr. Anguish: Exactly.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, perhaps that is why there are no Liberal premiers in the country, and there will not be a federal Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who is Liberal, much longer.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy being in the House when the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) speaks because he speaks as a populist. Although I do not agree with many of the things he says, he speaks as someone who has been around for quite a while. In fact, he has been around in the Social Credit movement, but I think his views are quite different from those of most Tories who speak as if they and the multinational oil companies were one and the same operation. It is refreshing to hear the other side of the situation, however. I do not disagree with the hon. member that perhaps there is poverty and people who are poor in Alberta. I wonder how this has come about when the government of Alberta has probably the largest revenues per capita of certainly any government in the country and probably of almost any government in the world. It has a massive heritage fund, but at the same time the hon. member tells me that there is poverty and that people are starving. I wonder how that can happen in this land of plenty.

Also I heard the hon. member talk about this institution being non-democratic, a dictatorship, and so on. I cannot quite understand this. He said that the minister was not in the House for a couple of minutes and that he did not remember a situation in the Alberta legislature where a minister was not present all the time a bill like this one was being debated. As I recall the period when the hon. member was a member of the Alberta legislature, which I gather was approximately 25 years, there was rarely more than three or four opposition members. I cannot imagine a bill being discussed more than two or three days with only three or four opposition members, unless the government itself wanted to talk about it forever.

There have been 86 days of debate on the first part of the National Energy Program. There will have been 35 days on this part, and I do not know how many dozens of opposition days along the same line. We have spent at least two thirds of a year in the House or in committee on these bills. The hon. member for Bow River has spoken at least a half dozen or a dozen times. I would say half a dozen would be the minimum because I heard him speak many times. I have spoken at least a dozen times on these bills. How can anyone say that members of the House have not been given a chance to speak on these matters? How can anyone say that this place is undemocratic? It is beyond me. I have spoken at least a dozen times on this or on similar bills. If I sat down and added it up, I am sure it would probably be 20 or 25 times. I just do not understand the notion that this is not a democratic procedure. I do not think there is a parliament anywhere in the world where members would spend more time deliberating on legislation than we do in this Parliament. That is certainly not done in the mother Parliament in Britain where a bill such as this would go through in two or three sittings. It is amazing that hon. members of the opposition are attempting to convey to the public through the television medium that we are not democratic, that we do not have a chance to debate these bills and that they are rammed through. We have spent 86 days, another 35 days, as well as the opposition days, and we are still debating the same bill. I just do not understand.

I started off my comments by saying that the hon. member for Bow River has a different approach. I think it is because he has a different background and a different sensitivity than many of the other members of his party. It was perhaps a week or two ago when I heard the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) speaking to another related bill. He talked about Reaganomics and all of the positive events which were occurring in the United States. I repeatedly heard this from the Conservatives, so I read some of the speeches made by such hon. members as the financial critic, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson). They are all preoccupied with this notion of Reaganomics.

● (2100)

During this debate on the national energy bill I can see the same kind of attitude prevailing, namely that we have to cut taxes to safeguard one segment of our society. It is called the sparrow theory whereby if you feed the horse enough oats the sparrows will survive. That is the type of predominant attitude we find among the majority of members on that side of the House.

Since I am a convert to this particular party, I am familiar with other party philosophies. I have always felt since I have been a member in the House that the Conservative opposition members have a great deal of difficulty in becoming united because they basically do not have a central point of view. They have a large right wing, a very active and articulate left wing—what is called the red Tories—but with really nothing