

When one looks at the global energy situation, in the period since the Second World War, if you look back over the last 30 or 40 years, you will find that the statistics indicate that our demand on energy over the last 30 years doubled roughly every ten years. Indeed, comparing this statistic with the increase in the western world, at least, of the gross national product, one finds it is identical. In other words, gross national product in the western world increased or doubled every ten years. One can then make the correlation, or project ahead, by saying that the gross national product, or the improvement of the quality of life of western countries, will be directly related to the availability of energy in the future.

At the present time the total producibility of oil—and I am talking here exclusively about oil—is in the neighbourhood of 60 to 65 million barrels a day. We know, on the basis of projections which have been put together not only for the producing but also by the consuming countries and which are in the main quite accurate, that unless we can expect an increase in the total producibility of world oil of 1 per cent per year for the next five to eight years, and beyond that, we will have to begin to live with the situation where supplies of conventional sources of fossil fuels and energy sources will decline. Up to the year 2,000—in fact, after the year 1985—we must expect a decline beginning with 1 per cent per year and then accelerating at a much faster pace.

If we go back to the relationship with the gross national product, we find a very frightening picture, because we would have to accept the fact that the economies of the western world would no longer be able to grow. In fact the economies of the western world would inevitably decline if we continue to rely on the conventional methods of driving our industrial machine and sustaining our enviable lifestyle. It is a frightening picture as well, because many say that an economy of the type we have built for ourselves in the western world cannot survive unless there is an element of growth.

Many say that a business cannot survive unless there is an element of growth, an opportunity for people to progress within an organization. Indeed, many say that if our economies cannot survive at the present level and cannot grow, our political system is in jeopardy. And many say that this is a very important component of the oil politics which the east bloc countries and the Soviet Union are relying upon to destroy capitalism and the system of western democracy. That is basically the global picture.

If one now turns to the situation in North America, it is no secret that we in Canada and in the United States are using the lion's share of the world's energy resources. We are wasting more than we are using, of course, and we are criticized not only by our partners in the western world but, in the United Nations and other forums, by other nations which look upon us as irresponsible people who have little or no concern for the legitimate aspirations of people in other parts of the world.

If you look at North America you are confronted, first of all, with the demographic situation—260 million people on the North American continent; we in Canada number 23 or 24

million. When we talk to our rich neighbours to the south, we are immediately confronted with their attempts to establish some kind of North American energy approach. We in Canada have, of course, always rejected that, because when it boils down to where the potential for future energy reserves lie, they lie in Canada. Since we number only 23 million people we should, of course, be very careful about how we share this energy, particularly with our friends to the south, but with other countries as well.

This is okay up to a point. But I want to portray a hypothetical situation, and this message is directed to my friends in the New Democratic Party, those great economic nationalists and energy nationalists. I want to portray a situation in the year 2000. Energy is extremely short and the world population has grown from four and a half billion to six billion people. Most of the new population is based in the Third World. They, of course, will have achieved a much better lifestyle and in so doing they will have placed incredible demands on the world's deliverability of oil and other energy resources, and the world is running out of fossil fuels. But we in Canada have been very prudent because in 1980, 1982, 1983 and 1985 we were very careful not to export any of our fossil reserves—gas, oil or anything else—to the United States or to any other country. So here we are.

• (1710)

The rest of the world machine has ground to a halt. People are freezing to death and sitting in the dark, but here we are in Canada with the lights shining brightly, our machines running at full tilt, and we are continuing this lifestyle which we have enjoyed and which our forefathers have built for us. Well, sir, I do not think that even my friends in the New Democratic Party are so naive as to think that that is actually possible and that we can actually totally isolate ourselves from the global situation of energy politics, and from the global situation of demographic politics, and sit here in Canada on top of all our wealth and enjoy it just for the benefit of ourselves and those who may come after us. The reality, as all of us know, is of course much different.

Instead of a continental energy policy we should be talking about continental energy co-operation. It is indeed against that background—I give credit to the former government, and I would even like to give a little credit to the present government—that some of the decisions that are relating to the most prominent project at the present time, the Alaska highway gas pipeline, have to be made.

We have to consider first of all that this particular project was planned to deliver gas which is exploited or harvested in Alaska to the lower 48 states. The Americans came to us in 1970 when the same question was raised in connection with delivering oil from Alaska to the United States. They came to us then as well, and told us that the most expedient, best, safest and cheapest way would be to run a pipeline through Alaska and through Canada, and to utilize as much as possible existing conduits and existing facilities to bring this important