

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie on a point of order.

**Mr. Symes:** Perhaps Madam Speaker can correct me, but I believe I started at 9.20 and have five minutes left.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The record shows that the hon. member commenced at 9.14, so his time expired at 9.54.

**Mr. Symes:** A further point of order, Madam Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie on a further point of order.

**Mr. Symes:** Were deductions made for all the interruptions by Conservative and Liberal party members?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** They were the best part of your speech.

**Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni):** Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of speaking on Bill C-49 dealing with taxation. Since the comments tonight have dealt almost exclusively with the oil industry and Syncrude, perhaps I may be allowed a few minutes to speak on the same subject. In the debate I have heard in this House over the last several days regarding oil, taxation and Syncrude, a few points have not been mentioned, and I should like to refer to them now.

I believe most hon. members realize, with today's economy and oil shortages that there is a tremendously explosive situation in the Middle East which could erupt any day. We have no guarantee of oil from the Middle East today, tomorrow, or at any time in the future. Certainly this is a very untenable situation for Canada; we cannot rely upon this oil or upon these suppliers.

If the government were to say that the Athabasca tar sands, our greatest known oil resource, are a dangerous gamble and that we are going to rely upon the supply of energy by other nations, then I think the government would be derelict in its duty, because we cannot rely upon other sources of energy. When a government takes power it must gamble on the side of safety; it must protect the Canadian consumer. It would be irresponsible if we did not take every means we have available in order to ensure a supply of oil for Canada, regardless of what any opposition party may say.

Secondly, in discussing Syncrude and taxation, the government must surely make every attempt to see we are self-sufficient in energy in the future. Not only do we not have a safe source of energy supply from outside Canada; it is the government's responsibility to protect the Canadian consumer pricewise, and we all know that the price of oil across the border and from across the seas is much higher than what we are paying in Canada. Again I think the government would be derelict in its duty if it did not make every attempt to produce oil for Canadians at a price that Canadians can afford.

We are very fortunate to be one of the few industrial nations of the world that are not being held hostage to fortune. The position we are in today has been called luck, it has been called good management. I really do not care

### *Adjournment Motion*

what it is called so long as our balance of payments is not such that we are bled to death paying for oil we can produce ourselves.

I take umbrage at the remarks of the last speaker who would let political motives interfere with what I consider to be a duty. This duty is to get oil on stream regardless of what are our political motives. Because it is for Canadians, not for political philosophy—

**Mr. Leggett:** We don't want another sell out like the Columbia River treaty.

**Mr. Anderson:** The members of the NDP say we are gambling by putting money into Syncrude. By the same token, other members of that party say that we should not gamble just a little bit but a whole big bit, which of course is not very realistic. There is no question about it: this is a gamble. The high cost of producing Syncrude oil is a gamble, because there is no certainty as to what the cost of oil will be a year from now, five years from now, or ten years from now. If the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) will put a guarantee on it, then I will buy shares in the company. But until there is a guarantee on it, it is a gamble.

The fact that we, as a government, are gambling the tax money of Canadians on this project is to some members, perhaps, repugnant. However, I must emphasize again that if we are going to gamble, let us gamble on the side of safety, on the side of having oil five years or ten years from now, so we will not be held hostage. If we are going to gamble and make errors, then let us make the error that we have more oil than we need.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Anderson:** I am very happy to hear that the NDP opposition is awake and listening tonight. I am glad to know they are listening to remarks having to do with resources. I am very interested in resources, coming from British Columbia. Unfortunately, we have had the experience of the government imposing royalties, trying to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please.

● (2200)

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

#### LABOUR RELATIONS—SUGGESTED CREATION OF LABOUR RELATIONS COUNCIL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** On Friday last I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) about the possible organization of a Canada Labour relations council to assist government in a regular review of issues affecting labour relations, where the emphasis would be on the parties seeking joint solutions to their problems, but where the government's lively interest in the resolution of these questions, with all that this implies, would be felt.