

face today results from the fact that we have committed these resources without sufficient planning. Right now there is an application by Ontario Hydro before the National Energy Board for the export of a fantastic amount of electricity to the United States.

We in the NDP say that if we had had a long-range program years ago in respect of our national energy, we would now have a grid stretching from the eastern part of Canada to the west and we would be able to export the surpluses from provinces east and west, instead of selling it all to the south and along with it the jobs we believe should rightfully belong to the people of Canada. We do not hesitate to press for this program. We shall continue to press for this type of national energy policy so far as Canadians are concerned.

● (2110)

Now I shall go back for a few moments to outline for members of this House the activities of our group since we came back here on January 4 this year. We are rather happy with the results we have achieved over this short period of time so far as having the government put into effect our energy policies. Since January 4, 1973, when this session started, the NDP group has seen many aspects of our energy policy accepted by the government. We pressed hard for a series of changes because they were in the best interests of Canadians generally and because there was increasing need for action in many areas. As a result of our efforts we have seen the beginning of a national energy policy for Canada. We will continue to press for action until a fully comprehensive policy has been laid down to ensure that the future of our country in this key energy field has been fully protected.

A number of our proposals have in fact been accepted by the government. We have seen the imposition of an export tax on oil. It has been a factor in keeping down inflation on oil products in Canada while ensuring that our Canadian exports are not undersold in the international market. It also makes certain that the windfall profits from soaring international prices come back to the Canadian people where they rightfully belong. No action has been taken in the province of Alberta, under a Conservative government, to ensure that these windfall profits are retained for the people of that province.

The cries of anguish over this export tax from members of the official opposition in the House show very clearly where they stand. We called for a price freeze and fought to have it extended past the end of January, 1974. Once again the government has accepted a proposal which means many millions of dollars of savings to the people of Canada. Other proposals are the removal of the Ottawa Valley line which divided Canada, energywise, into two sections; the building of a reversible oil pipeline to Montreal to ensure continuity of oil supplies to that area in the event of an international emergency; the proposed setting up of a national petroleum corporation. Also, the proposed public development under Canadian ownership of the oil sands and of activities in the north are clear indications that our NDP group has been successful in putting our case on energy development before this House. It also shows that we were years ahead of the policy planners in the two old-line parties.

Energy

Mr. Speaker, there is just one more point I should like to make before I complete my comments. This has to do with the conventional oil reserves we still have in Canada. Again, I do not think Canadians should be fooled by the myth that somehow or other we have energy which we can get at immediately. It will take time. I do not think we will have the lead-time to develop other sources of energy and the tar sands unless we have a close look at the export situation so far as our oil and gas reserves are concerned. Many Tories are very anxious to see the price freeze come to an end in January. They have indicated they are in favour of a graduated increase in price until it ends up possibly a little below the international price. This is the penalty the people of Canada will pay if we have this type of Tory policy foisted upon us.

From November 1, 1972, to August 1, 1973, there was a 95-cent increase in the price of oil received by the oil companies. This gave them profits of \$700 million over the full run of a year. If the \$1.90 export tax is lifted, this will mean double that amount for the international oil corporations—and we say no.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre).

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, this motion we are debating today, and upon which we will vote later this day, certainly describes very accurately this government's performance in attempting to formulate an energy policy for Canada. "Incompetent," "inconsistent" and "vacillating" are certainly accurate adjectives in describing this Liberal-NDP policy which we have. They are not the only adjectives which could be used. Vacillating and inconsistent, certainly this government has been; but it has been much more. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) have done an about-face and have gone back on their word so often that they can only be described as incredible.

Let me remind the House of just a few instances where this government has said one thing and then a short time later has said something quite different, and in some cases the opposite. Consider the general question of Canada's energy policy. A year ago the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said a new energy policy was being prepared and would shortly be forthcoming after an already prolonged gestation period. With each passing month the labour pains grew increasingly severe—but still no policy. Finally, with an admission that it was not a policy but rather an analysis which would be forthcoming, a green paper eventually appeared in the latter part of June. To give credit where credit is due, this so-called green paper on energy contained much useful information and advice. For example, on page 9 of the green paper the government states:

Federal and provincial responsibilities and interests in the energy field are intimately related. No national policy can be contemplated without the fullest of intergovernmental consultation and consensus.

Good advice! But just two months after this statement the Prime Minister, on September 4 and then on December 6, announced what amounts to a totally new national oil policy, with essentially no consultation with and certainly