

Energy

differences should be, 'twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee". I thought of Alice in Wonderland. Tweedledum and Tweedledee talked alike, looked alike, acted alike but said they were different. The consumers are saying there is no difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals in terms of price. The consumers are paying higher energy prices. There is no agreement with Alberta and so the consumers are not getting money back in their pockets. They say progress is not being made on renewables and conservation. They want to know what is happening. It is really a Tweedledum, Tweedledee situation.

This was set out in Jennifer Lewington's article in *The Globe and Mail* of Monday, March 23, 1981. Under present government policies, the article states that consumers are paying less for gasoline than they would have paid under the Conservative policy. However, they are paying more for heating oil than they would have under the Conservative policy. That is the truth of the matter.

The minister was not intentionally misleading the Canadian public but he was nevertheless misleading in his speech a few minutes ago. He said that if Alberta settled the dispute on pricing today, he could reduce the price of gas by seven cents a gallon. The Canadian people were not born yesterday. They know that if there is a settlement with Alberta and if the government, to use the minister's words, is willing to be flexible in its negotiations and is willing to compromise, that means higher prices. Does the minister think the Canadian people believe that if there is an oil agreement with Alberta, a higher oil price agreement, then he will withdraw the seven cents a gallon? He will subtract that, but he will still increase prices. He is misleading the people by saying that.

The other matter with respect to the minister's speech concerns consumers. He said this government had taken measures to protect consumers. Well, what has the government done? It took the watchdog for consumers, Mr. Bertrand, who produced the report showing that the oil companies had ripped off Canadian consumers anywhere from \$12 billion to \$14 billion under both Liberal and Conservative governments, and dumped him in the Anti-dumping Tribunal. What did the government do with the report? It sent it to another tribunal for more study and action.

The minister said the government had shifted Canadians off oil to gas. That is a good idea. In part it is going to subsidize the building of a gas pipeline to the maritimes. That is a good idea, but only if those Canadians can be assured that, having converted their oil furnaces to gas, they will be able to get cheap and available Canadian gas in the future.

At the same time as the government has approved the pre-build of the Alaska pipeline to continually ship out cheap Canadian gas to the United States, there is a real chance that the consumers, those in the maritimes in particular, who have converted from oil to gas will have to pay more in the end because there will be no cheap Canadian gas available.

The minister should not pretend that this Liberal energy program is any better than the Conservative program. I want to deal with that program and the promises that were made.

The Liberals were elected on the promise that their price would be less than \$4 more in 1980 and less than prices would be under the Conservative program by 1984. However, we have to look at the National Energy Program, which is a detailed blueprint of what the Liberal party really wants. There is a new promise in the National Energy Program. It talks about an increase of \$3 in 1980 and \$4.50 in 1981, 1982 and 1983. For consumers, under this schedule the pump price so far would have increased 23 cents a gallon since the Liberals were elected. This was the promise of 1980; this was the new promise in the National Energy Program. The price was to increase by 23 cents a gallon.

● (1620)

What has happened, Mr. Speaker? There have been ten increases, and I will count them. On March 1, 1980 there was a \$1 per barrel crude increase. I mentioned Toronto so let us take an Imperial Oil station in metropolitan Toronto for my example. At that time you would be paying 25.4 cents per litre. In 1980 there was a \$1 per barrel crude increase which meant an increase of .7 cents a litre, bringing the price to 25.4 cents a litre. There was a second increase on April 22, 1980. There was a change in federal sales tax which added .5 cents per litre, making the cost 25.9 cents a litre. Third, there was a Syncrude levy increasing the price .5 cents a litre, which made the price 26.4 cents a litre. Fourth, there was a \$2 per barrel crude increase plus higher company costs on September 30, 1980, adding two cents a litre, making the price 28.4 cents a litre. Fifth, there was a sales tax increase in the Syncrude levy on November 1, 1980, which added .6 cents a litre, making the price 29 cents a litre.

On January 1, 1981, there was a petroleum compensation charge of 1.9 cents a litre, which increased the price to 30.9 cents a litre. Can you not see that pump price going up and up as you fill your car? On March 1, 1981, the seventh increase took place. There was an increase in the price of crude, or a higher company cost it was called, of 1.3 cents a litre, which made the price 32.2 cents a litre. On March 3, 1981, there was a surtax because of the Alberta cutback of .5 cents a litre and the price then became 32.7 cents a litre. On May 1, 1981, the PetroCan levy occurred, which was .8 cents a litre, so the price became 33.5 cents a litre. Finally, there was a tenth increase on June 2, 1981. It was a petroleum compensation charge of .8 cents a litre, and a cutback levy of an additional .8 cents a litre. So this morning in metropolitan Toronto at that Esso station you are paying 35.1 cents a litre. It is strange that there should be these differences between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. What the consumers see is a rapid increase in the price of gasoline no matter which party, Conservatives or Liberals, they placed their trust in.

We have also seen an inability to reach a negotiated settlement with the producing provinces. The minister has said it is a tragedy that one province should cut back the export of a commodity like oil to another part of the country. That should not happen in a confederation and I agree with him, but I wonder what the minister expects. This does not make that right, but what does the minister expect when he unilaterally