## Summer Recess

producing provinces, naturally enough, are insisting that they receive the same net benefits from this government that they would have received from the agreement we had prepared. That is understandable, but the point for this Parliament to underline is that all the people of Canada also have the right to expect that Canada will get equivalent benefits from the Liberal agreement, equivalent to those benefits Canada would have received from the agreement two days short of signing by the Progressive Conservative government defeated last year.

The Prime Minister is apparently meeting the premier of Alberta. He may well have a proposal to make. He has an adjournment ahead of him. I want to suggest some items for his agenda during that adjournment as they relate to energy policy. I would like him to bear in mind, as I believe the Canadian people are increasingly bearing in mind, the important elements of the comprehensive energy proposal which we made and which the Liberal party and the NDP, for their own narrow political reasons, voted against.

• (1540)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: Those elements of that proposal were designed to build Canadian security, were designed to ensure Canadian supply, and they included some of the following. First, they included a pricing regime which would be sufficient to lead to exploration in this country, including non-conventional exploration in areas where exploration has not occurred successfully before, and which would lead the producers of this country to go forward and to guarantee security of Canadian supply, because we believe that Canada, with the resources available to it, with the initiative of its people and of its industry, is eminently capable of becoming self-sufficient in energy by the year 1990. That was our goal, that should be the goal of Canada, that can be the goal of Canada, and that is a goal which apparently has been abandoned by the Liberal government and which I recommend that they adopt, not in my interest but in the interest of the nation that they will govern for a few years more.

## Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Second, that energy package put together to secure Canada's energy future, to take advantage of the rare resource we have as an energy nation, provided—and I say this for the special information of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who, unhappily is absent—a force majeure clause which would have permitted the Government of Canada to separate Canadian price, to an even greater degree than was in the agreement spelled out, from the changes that might occur in world price, in prices by OPEC. That force majeure clause was an item of protection which was in our agreement, and we have no way of knowing what protection, if any, will be in the agreement signed by the Liberal government, if indeed there is one.

Third, we recognized as a fundamental element of an energy policy for Canada that there had to be help to those Canadians who were going to be hit hardest by the increases in price that

were inevitable in a modern world economy. So we introduced an energy tax credit which would have been available to the lower income and harder hit Canadians across the country, an energy tax credit, I would remind the House, voted against by the NDP and voted against by the Liberal party, but introduced by this party, introduced by the government we formed, as a fundamental element of a national energy package—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: I am being heckled by the hon. member for Timmins-Chapleau (Mr. Chénier). I wanted to say the hon. member for Hollywood, but it is Timmins. His interjection was a complaint against the tax credit. I am not surprised that he should interject against the tax credit since the other night he applauded the imposition of an increase in the price that his constituents have to pay for home heating oil, an increase they would not have had to pay under our government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: We introduced those measures of aid to help Canadians who would be hardest hit. That was another major element of that program. Again we recognized that there were in some parts of Canada energy generation which depended excessively upon petroleum. So we offered special help to the province of Nova Scotia and to the province of Prince Edward Island so that they would be better able to deal with the increases which were inevitable in the current international energy situation. We proposed an energy self-sufficiency tax which would have yielded some \$6 billion. We proposed a tax that the NDP voted against which would have taken \$6 billion from the large multinational oil companies of this country. The NDP voted to spare multinationals from a \$6 billion tax burden which we proposed to introduce.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: That energy self-sufficiency tax imposed upon the energy industry was to have been directed entirely to energy supply and to developing conservation in this country.

We proposed the establishment, as part of that package, of a Canadian energy bank which would encourage individual Canadians and Canadian controlled companies to invest in Canadian energy projects. Again there has been no mention of that important factor, no similar instrument spelled out by the Liberal party. This party stands committed—and we proved it with the energy bank—to the concept of Canadian ownership of the Canadian energy industry. That is a principle which was voted against by the NDP, it was an initiative which was voted against by the Liberal party, but we believed in it and we set it forth in the energy package which was brought forth by us as a government. We believe in Canadian ownership of Canadian energy resources, and we gave Canadians a program which would have accomplished that goal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Those are some of the elements of our energy package, and the NDP was caught in the act of voting against