## Energy

## **(1550)**

Since 1963 output per unit of energy consumed has changed as follows, and again I am using Royal Bank figures: Britain, up 25 per cent; Japan, up 12 per cent; West Germany, up 10 per cent; the United States, up 2.3 per cent; and Canada, down 5.3 per cent.

Government policy has unwittingly encouraged Canadian industry to be less efficient in its use of energy than its main competitors. Industry is now forced to adjust, and in a short period of time, to these new realities.

If this government does not produce a rational and comprehensive energy policy, Canadian industry will continue to suffer and will continue to lose market position. It will continue to have a lack of confidence to invest and expand in these new industries in the future. Valuable business opportunities will be lost in all parts of the country.

Let me urge the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gray) to work closely with his colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde), to establish policies and guidelines to encourage the highest possible procurement of Canadian goods and services in the energy field, both in the megaprojects and frontier areas as well as in the conventional fields. Canadian companies have proven to be both competitive and innovative in meeting this challenge.

Government support in the form of procurement policy guidelines could help to carry this success further. This need not be done in a punitive way. Government guidelines can set the operational background. One of the departments could act as a clearing house to ensure that oil companies were aware of the Canadian talent available.

Finally, research and development policies should be formulated to assist these Canadian companies to stay abreast of current technology. In this way Canadian companies can place themselves in the forefront of the market place and be in a position to exploit the huge international market in energy development in the future.

Canada is endowed with massive reserves of many forms of energy and other natural resources. I have spoken in the past of the importance of matching these two ingredients in the development of our industrial policy. There will be many opportunities in the future as the value of these resources increases and their availability decreases. We must be alert to these opportunities and provide the industrial structure and policies to capitalize on them.

Australia today provides the most spectacular example of that to which I refer. Australia is currently planning seven aluminum smelters. Because of high energy costs and scarce supplies Japan is closing down aluminum smelters and will import the finished product from Australia in the future. The reason is very simple: Australia has cheap and readily available coal, as well as the principal natural resource, bauxite.

There will be other opportunities, not necessarily on the same scale, in situations where Canada can combine our plentiful energy and natural resources with profitable, job-

creating industrial development. The opportunity is clear. Energy is the number one growth industry for Canada.

We implore the government to show some real sense of urgency, some direction, in order to give our industry the confidence and the sense of commitment that this promise can be fulfilled. The performance by the government to date has been dismal, practically non-existent, and in some ways even negative. This must change if we are to create the jobs, the investment, the new technology, the exports and the sharing of all these benefits by all Canadians.

Energy is our future; it can bind us together and make us strong. This government has chosen to use it to make us weak, to divide us and to undermine our confidence. It is absolutely essential to the strength and future of our country that this government develop a comprehensive energy policy on an urgent basis in order to capture the economic development opportunities which are available and to protect Canada, particularly Ontario and eastern provinces, from the increasing threat to our energy security. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

## Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for my party, the New Democrats, on this motion today. As I was listening to the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), I had the horrible sense of  $d\acute{e}j\grave{a}$  vu, that we had been through this before, had this debate before. I checked through Hansard and I found that, indeed, we did, on July 8, 1980. I believe the preceding speaker mentioned that we had spoken on a Conservative opposition day on a motion virtually covering the same topic. I will send a copy of my speech given on July 8 to the hon. member. We will all see, if we look at that debate, that not much has really changed in the interim. We will find that nothing has happened. As the hon. member from Calgary has said, nothing has happened, the situation has become worse. That is true.

We have no energy policy in this country and there does not seem to be one on the horizon. There has not been an energy policy for a number of months, and the country is suffering. The minister can check the situation with any of the members of the all-party committee on national resources and public works. That committee of the House of Commons, of which I and some of my colleagues are members, travelled to the tar sands this summer, as well as to Washington. We saw areas where there is certainly a need for energy policy.

I want to speak today about some of our concerns and ideas regarding a real energy policy for Canada. My colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie), later in the debate, will speak about an issue that has had little debate in this House of Commons, the nuclear issue. In my view and that of my colleagues, this is a matter the Liberal government is really sweeping under the rug. I see here the parliamentary secretary to the minister who has been the outstanding culprit in this particular matter, no doubt following government policy. I invite the minister who intends to speak after me to reply.