

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

PROPOSED TERMINAL AT PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Madam Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of recent reports that the Canadian Wheat Board is offering a \$100 million interest-free loan to the consortium that plans to build the new grain terminal at Prince Rupert, and in view of the fact that the interest costs for the loan will be a charge against money realized from sales of producers' grain and, in effect, an act of conversion or theft by the board of producers' money, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson):

That the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board instruct the board to withdraw its offer and cancel their plans for such a loan, and further that the minister have the law officers of the Crown review the Canadian Wheat Board Act and, if necessary, bring in amendments to ensure that the powers of the board are restricted to the basic principles on which the Canadian Wheat Board was established.

Madam Speaker: This motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

1988 WINTER OLYMPICS—SUPPORT OF BID BY CALGARY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move under Standing Order 43, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Kushner):

That this House supports the city of Calgary in its bid to host the 1988 Winter Olympic Games.

Madam Speaker: This motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: There is unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Does the House agree to the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

EFFECTS ON OIL SUPPLY—IMPACT ON CASH FLOWS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Daily we receive reports of the disastrous effects of the program on future supply of oil in this country. We have heard from the Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Montreal, the Toronto-Dominion Bank, and today Chevron announced a cutback of \$330 million in its exploration program, with a Mobil \$164 million cutback in addition to many other cutbacks by both independent and multinational companies.

When will the government accept the fact that all these actions which have been proposed by the companies, plus the advice which has been received, indicate that the National Energy Program, particularly the tax policies under that National Energy Program, is leading this country into a very serious supply crisis in the 1980s? More specifically, will the government withdraw the National Energy Program and replace it with a white paper, so that there can be proper discussion of the energy program following which specific policies can be introduced?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, it is not the intention of the government to withdraw the National Energy Program. As I stated yesterday, the main elements of that program are widely supported—

● (1415)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Where?

An hon. Member: Even you don't believe that.

Mr. MacEachen:—by the Canadian population. If the hon. member's point is that the new federal taxes are affecting the cash flow of the industry, that, of course, is readily accepted because any tax which is implemented without loopholes is bound to have that effect.

However, despite the effect of the taxes on the industry, I think it is absolutely clear that the cash flow available to the industry is ample and growing. There is no other sector in the Canadian economy which has the opportunity for growth and development this industry has. I think the hon. member ought to bear that in mind instead of repeating the doleful dirges he has repeated today in his question.

Mr. Wilson: Madam Speaker, everyone agrees with the broad elements of the program, but the actual details of the program are undermining those elements, particularly in the area of supply. Has the government been monitoring the current National Energy Board hearings on supply at which company after company is saying that the supply objectives of