

● (1140)

I have spoken in the House before about the social costs of increased unemployment and the reality that a 1 per cent increase in unemployment will bring about an approximate 5 per cent increase in stress-related diseases, including suicide, alcoholism, spousal battery and child battery. These things come as the natural consequence of bad economic policy in a country. When we make a mistake in this Chamber, the ripple effects and the consequences of that mistake can be enormous for individual Canadians. We have made nothing but mistakes in the last five or six years in terms of energy policy, nothing but mistakes. I feel proud and comfortable just to belong to a political Party which is moving as quickly as it can to rectify those mistakes and to turn the situation around.

I look forward to an energy agreement in the next few weeks which will say clearly to Canadians that we are returning to market-based pricing. We must have market-based pricing for the commodity called oil. We must move as quickly as we can to that market-based mechanism for the commodity called natural gas and for all other commodities within the energy field. In different parts of the country it will make sense to heat homes with one kind of fuel and in other parts of the country with different kinds of fuel. However, if we move artificiality into that system, we distort the market, our productivity and the long-term potential efficiency of the nation.

I spent the weekend in the Town of Oyen near the Saskatchewan border. It happened to be the fiftieth wedding anniversary of my aunt and uncle. On such an occasion there is time for reflection. When one tries to celebrate an event of that kind which spans a 50-year period of time, one looks back. We were sitting out there on the Prairies, on the Saskatchewan border, in the heart of wheat country. We noticed the snow. People were happy about the snow because they have been close to a drought situation for a couple of years and the presence of a great deal of snow augurs well for the potential of a good crop. When one looks back over that period of time, one realizes that this couple was married in an era when they travelled by horseback and transported grain in horse-drawn wagons. Now, 50 years later, we have jet airplanes, cars and highways. It provides one with a chance to reflect on how far the country has come, how far that particular region has come, in a period of 50 years.

Then one stops for a minute and says that one thing which was different 50 years ago is that government did not think it knew best. We did not have so many experts. We let people make their own decisions. We did not raise taxation to the point where we were taking money, great amounts of money, out of the pockets of people and letting bureaucrats and politicians decide how to spend it. We let people decide in their own wisdom how best to spend it. When it comes to the elimination of these two programs, all we are really saying to the Canadian people and to the House is: let the people decide; do not bribe them to make a decision which is not really in their best interests.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### *Oil Substitution Act*

**Mr. Parry:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to correct some of the fallacies and allegations inherent in the Hon. Member's speech, but with only 10 minutes to do it I will be put under some pressure. The Hon. Member used the term "insanity"—and indeed, if we listened to some of the comments this morning we must admit that he had some justification—to describe the legislation which the Government now plans to repeal.

In view of the fact that the Act implementing the Canadian Oil Substitution Program was passed in 1981, with second reading in one hour, referred to Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent and inside an hour read a third time and passed, does the Hon. Member think that that insanity was endemic in his Party at the time or that it was simply an aberration? Is he using the term "insanity" in a clinical or colloquial fashion?

Finally, I should like him to comment upon the observation of the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), who said at the time: "I want to conclude by congratulating the Minister again for bringing this legislation forward". Let us hear what the Hon. Member considers insanity to be.

**Mr. Hawkes:** The insanity continues, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River will listen carefully. Some of his colleagues have heard this before. If we repeat it often enough they will begin to understand.

The minute the decision was made to implement the National Energy Program, to hold the true market value of oil at a minimum of 25 per cent below its value, it encouraged consumption of a scarce commodity which we could not produce in the country. The next thing the Government did was take away the cash which would have produced more oil in the country and chased out investment capital to the tune of \$18 billion, which was destroying jobs and increasing the need to import oil. They increased consumption and had the need to import more because there was not enough; that was the basic insanity.

This program at that point was the only thing the majority Liberal Government was willing to bring into place which was partly in the direction of sanity. If we do all these other bad things, then we have to have something which will stimulate the economy as quickly as possible. That happened in the insulation industry and the energy substitution industry. They were chasing out a lot more than they were bringing in, but at least that created a few jobs and hopefully it would reduce to some extent the need to import oil.

In the midst of all that total insanity, this was the sanest piece of legislation to attempt to mitigate that massive insanity represented in the totality of the program. That is the context. I see from the nods across the way that maybe they are beginning to understand, hopefully.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to how the Hon. Member tried to weasel his way out of his previous statement, unsuccessfully I must say. Could he indicate to us what was the real policy of the Conservative Party