

the oil business with a tax advantage over a Canadian. If you were dedicated to the principle of Canadian ownership of the industry, Mr. Speaker, you would not tolerate that kind of uncertainty and absurdity.

How about the energy policy of this government? Energy should be an absolute key to economic development and investor policy. I have yet to read the writings of any expert, any think tank or economist who has not reached the conclusion that in the future that industry will come to those who have energy. That will be the key to industrial development in the future. We as a nation, unique among the Big Seven, the OECD nations, unique among the western world, have the opportunity to be energy self-sufficient, to have energy where some of our competitors might not have that option. In spite of that, what does this government do? Are they for self-sufficiency or are they not? Who can tell? It depends on what speech you read and at what time of the year you read it. One says yes, the other says no, and another one yet says maybe.

Even when they say yes—I think that is the recent signal—they do nothing to substantiate that apparent objective. If there were a coherent economic development policy and an industrial strategy in this country and it were based on going back to the land—that is, a coherent industrial strategy, if that is what they choose to have, to go back to the land and abandon the goals of industrial development, manufacturing, and high technology development—then let them state that, put it before the people of Canada and see if they want it. If it is not, if their policy really is what they say it is—that is, to develop industrially, to develop our manufacturing industry, to expand our trade with the rest of the world, to increase the job prospect of Canadians and to decrease regional disparities—then clearly an absolutely fundamental key to that is energy self-sufficiency.

This government could do nothing better for this country than to adopt immediately the policy of the Clark government: first, self-sufficiency; second, help for those Canadians who are least able to adjust to changes which will be necessary, and to provide for relief for those more adversely affected; and third, make sure that the benefits of the economic activity which will be generated from this pursuit of self-sufficiency are spread equitably across the country.

Mr. Paproski: I hope that Bud Olson is listening.

Mr. Andre: Science and technology is an absolute key to the future growth of this country. I once heard an excellent speech made by an economist who said that the key to the future of any country in this world is like a three-legged stool, which is the foundation, consisting of food, energy, and science and technology. Without one of those legs, the stool topples and the country does not make it. We have done absolutely nothing in terms of science and technology—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time of 30 minutes has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Economic Development

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Andre: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I assumed I had 40 minutes; otherwise I would have concluded my remarks. However, I will not prevail upon the House other than to add at this point that during the day we will elaborate on this issue. My colleagues, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson), the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. Gilchrist), the hon. member for Erie (Mr. Fretz) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Jelinek), we hope, will all have an opportunity to elaborate on some of the points I raised. We hope that, at the end of the day, the government will have a better understanding of where they should be going in this area.

• (1600)

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in addressing the motion before us today, one is immediately struck by the obvious conflict between employment-related political goals and a Canadian taxation structure, particularly in the corporate sector, which appears almost designed to provide incentives to those sectors of our economy least likely to create employment.

For example, for some years now the greatest write-offs and tax incentives have been provided to the capital-intensive oil and gas industry, an industry which perhaps provides the least jobs per investment dollar in Canada. Also it is the industry with the highest level of foreign control in this country, at least until very, very recently. This process continues on down the line with the next lowest taxation level to major resource industries. It continues until we finally come to the area of secondary manufacturing and the retail industry, the areas providing the highest number of jobs per dollar of investment and the highest degree of Canadian control and local ownership. They have the worst treatment under our tax structure. This is the sector where the highest level of taxation is paid.

Why? Surely two of the prime goals of any government, even this government and the previous government, must be to provide the greatest number of jobs for the least dollars and to encourage domestic control of our economy. I think all parties would agree with those over-all objectives, but the opposite is happening and it must be turned around. Not only must the emphasis, the weighting and direction of our taxation policies and strategies be changed to further the objectives of job creation and Canadian ownership, but our taxation structure itself must be altered in order that government taxation spending be seen and not hidden from public view; that visible grants replace hidden tax expenditures such as accelerated allowances and other invisible write-offs and incentives; that the recipients of these grants are then made financially accountable for such incentive grants as are proffered.

In other words, the government and the public should be in a clear position to demand performance and results for public moneys expended. I do not think that is a very revolutionary idea. I am sure other hon. members will agree that demanding value or performance in exchange for payment is hardly a