

The Address—Mr. Mazankowski

House does appreciate the fact that he has substituted the word, and second, that his point is not a point of order. The Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) was making a speech and I would ask him to resume.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange that they get so irritated over there. The truth always hurts. The National Energy Program which the NDP supported cost Ontario 90,000—

Mr. Waddell: We did not support the NEP.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe I misheard the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski). Once again I think he said that the New Democratic Party supported the National Energy Program when in fact, on every single vote regarding the National Energy Program, members of the NDP voted against it.

Mr. Mazankowski: There again we see the hypocrisy—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Of course, this is a point of disagreement; I would not think it would be a point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, we again see the hypocrisy of the gang over there. They have not changed and they never will. The fact of the matter is that the National Energy Program, which was supported by members of the New Democratic Party, cost the Ontario economy—

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is deliberately misleading this House. He has been told and he knows very well—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order. I believe the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway once again used an expression that may be unparliamentary. Does the Hon. Member wish to—

Mr. Waddell: No, Mr. Speaker. The truth is the truth. He is misleading the House. We never supported the National Energy Program. He knows that very well. He can check the record. He is deliberately misleading the House. Perhaps the Minister is prepared to temper his remarks. He is an honourable man. He knows that I was the energy critic for three years. He knows that I know about the votes. I think he is an honourable man. There are plenty of other targets that may be used against us. Why does he not use the real ones? If he is prepared to temper his remarks, I will—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order. I understand very well that the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway disagrees with the remarks. He has made his case quite clear on that point. However, I would also like to recall that the expression used by the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway is not permitted in this House and is considered unparliamentary. Taking into account the fact that his point was sufficiently made and that the Hon. Member has been very well understood up until now, I would once again reiterate the

demand I have just made and ask the Hon. Member to please re-state the phrase.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to change the phrase by saying that he has perhaps inadvertently misled the House. I expect that the Minister will do the honourable thing and recognize that we did not support the National Energy Program.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order. The Chair feels very much obliged to the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is acknowledging the fact that members of his Party have just done another flip-flop, then I will temper my remarks accordingly. However, the fact of the matter is that according to a recent study done by the Ontario Government, 90,000 jobs were allegedly lost as a result of this odious measure, the National Energy Program, and 70,000 jobs were lost in the Province of Alberta. It affected many other regions. It affected our balance of payments. It created a massive outflow of Canadian investment capital and destroyed generations of entrepreneurs and businessmen. There is no question about that. I am really happy to note that members of the NDP now recognize that it was a bad measure.

Those were some of the things that the people voted against in the last election. They also voted against a government which really divided this country. The National Energy Program was one issue which divided the country. The people also voted against a government which proclaimed that federalism was dead and said that it was not a workable unit. It pitted region against region, West against East, business against labour. The bitterness and strains of acrimony were clearly reflected in the outcome of the election that was held on September 4.

I could speak of the hidden agenda of the Liberal Party, which included the National Energy Program. I could discuss the unilateral way in which it wished to amend the Constitution, an action which again was supported by members of the New Democratic Party. They were going to treat western Canadian provinces as second-class provinces. Members of the NDP cannot weasel out of that one. Those were things that were never talked about during the 1980 election campaign. There was never any mention of the dismantling of VIA and of the dismantling of the Crow rate during the 1980 election campaign. Not a word was uttered. Therefore, we had that massive rejection.

As well, Canadians voted for a new government under the dynamic leadership of the current Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), a man who must be the most exciting political figure in Canada today. There is no question about that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: The Prime Minister was able to put together a team that is competent and compassionate, one which came forward with sensible policies and was able to