

The Address—Mr. Peterson

think that this made in Canada price of the Liberal Government was a good choice?

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Wright) neglects to look at the situation which existed in 1980. At that time shortages appeared to be imminent and critical. Of every dollar earned on oil and gas, 45 per cent went to the provinces, 45 per cent to the producer and only 10 per cent to the federal Government. This was way out of whack. Even people in the private sector said that the federal Government deserved a bigger share of the energy pie.

I make no apology for trying to redo that balance to a certain extent. The Hon. Member should realize that by far the biggest share of the tax revenue included in the price at the pump is the result of provincial taxes.

Mr. Jarvis: No it is not.

Mr. Peterson: He should also realize that much of the revenue that was generated from actual production is being plowed back into finding new reserves in Canada through incentives given to Canadian controlled private programs.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member praises the National Energy Program. That is incredible. Does he not know that four years later Canadian companies and oil companies generally produced less oil on any given day than they did four years ago? We are going backwards.

Mr. Gauthier: We don't use as much.

Mr. Hawkes: In the City of Calgary, the centre of the oil industry in Canada, there is a 21 per cent office vacancy rate, a 15 per cent vacancy rate in rental accommodation, and an unemployment rate higher than the national average. When the National Energy Program was brought in, Calgary had the most buoyant economy in the country. It was a city on the move, building for Canada and buying products from eastern Canada.

Could the Hon. Member tell us how many jobs were lost in the riding of Willowdale as a result of the National Energy Program and how many jobs were lost in Ontario? When I read the National Energy Program I stood in this House and said that Canadians would lose 300,000 jobs. I was wrong, Mr. Speaker; four years later 514,000 jobs had been lost, most of which are traceable to the disaster called the National Energy Program.

Mr. Gauthier: That is rubbish.

Mr. Hawkes: It chased capital out of the country. Can the Hon. Member tell us how many jobs were lost in his riding and in the Province of Ontario because of the National Energy Program? Is he proud of that record?

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, it amazes me that someone with the Hon. Member's background who has studied the international situation very carefully should ignore the fact that the price projected by OPEC to continue spiralling, has been cut back. The price is now around \$29, but the Party opposite

thought it was going to be \$45 or \$42. These were the projections in the 1979 Budget brought down by the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). There has been a cut-back in world production in many areas. In Houston, there are over 45 million square feet of unoccupied office space. Prices did not continue to skyrocket as we had anticipated but the consumer has benefited from that.

The Hon. Member spoke of the quantity produced. What we sought under the National Energy Program was self-sufficiency, and we are now self-sufficient in oil and have about 100 years of gas reserves ahead. I should like to see it exported and if Hon. Members opposite have any bright ideas on how we could make better use of it, I should like to hear them. We are asking Canadians to switch from oil to gas. Canadian producers with gas based feed stock will be given a much greater advantage in Canada than is enjoyed in many other parts of the world. This is the type of program that will increase our productivity and ensure that energy is working for the benefit of consumers as well as producers.

Mr. Wright: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Hon. Member for Willowdale why his Party voted against the sale of natural gas to the United States.

Mr. Peterson: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) has been doing a tremendous job of trying to open up international markets. He has been trying to find a place where the gas can be sold. If anyone has a better idea about how that can be done he or she should come and work with us instead of carping. This is not a matter for cheap partisan politics but is something that we should work on together for the benefit of the producers who want to find markets. If Hon. Members opposite have constructive ideas about how to sell gas abroad, they should come and work with us. That is the responsibility of a Member of Parliament.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will know that the oil and gas sector was the largest single consumer of trucks of any sector in the Canadian economy. He will also know that he and I represent a province where the majority of secondary manufacturing in automobile parts is located. Do I understand the Hon. Member correctly when he said that the purchase of such companies as Petrofina and British Petroleum have a higher priority in the interest of Canadians as compared to the protection of those jobs in the automobile parts sector of Ontario?

● (1720)

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I believe I would have to adjust my hearing aid or else have the Hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Jarvis) adjust his because I do not believe I made any such statement at all. If the point he is trying to make is that we need jobs in Ontario, then I want him to reflect on what types of jobs. Are they jobs which are going to enhance our productivity? Are they jobs which are going to give us a real increase in our standard of living? If they are, then they will have to be jobs which are oriented to providing goods or services, and probably both, which are competitive on a world basis.