

more advanced state of socialism, but not too long ago I saw the people in Czechoslovakia lining up for food and clothing, I saw the weariness and frustration in their eyes. The people in the United Kingdom, Sweden and other socialist countries are taxed to the point that productivity no longer exists.

Sweden, the United Kingdom and Italy are no longer competitive in many areas. Why are they not competitive? It is because of government intervention and the socialist myth that government can do it better. I never saw such a tragedy as the one in Prague, the hopelessness and despondency. That is what socialism has done for that country. Before the Second World War, Czechoslovakia was one of the most productive and innovative countries in Europe. I will not deny that the market system has its faults—yes, it produces an unequal distribution of wealth. I will grant that to my friends in the NDP, but as someone said—and I do not know who it was—that socialism creates an equal distribution of misery. The history of nationalized industry throughout the world is one of gross inefficiency and, consequently, a continuous drain on the resources of the economy. It is no exaggeration to say that the main reason the United Kingdom, Sweden and Italy have fared so badly in the recent past is due to their nationalized industries.

● (2100)

Mr. Rae: What is the unemployment rate in Sweden?

Mr. Thomson: The unemployment rate in Sweden is very close to 1 per cent or 2 per cent; however nobody can afford to buy anything, because they are taxed so heavily. As I said the other night, a person making \$25,000 a year pays \$13,000 a year in taxes. You can buy a pair of galoshes here in Canada that will cost \$10, but there I had to pay \$50 Canadian a pair. Their standard of living has gone from the second highest in the world in 1971 to nineteenth today.

An hon. Member: But they have full employment.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, they have full employment. But full employment is not creating any productivity for Sweden. It is forcing them to nationalize most of their industries. I would like to talk for a moment about the National Energy Program.

Underlying the whole thrust of the National Energy Program is the concept of state control. I challenge the Liberal government to deny that. That is why it was created. The man who created it was Dr. Edmund Clark, a committed socialist. That is something everyone knows. He wants state control over the energy industry in Canada. If the National Energy Program's objectives were security of supply and independence from world oil markets and, second, opportunity for Canadians to participate in the energy industry and fairness on pricing and revenue sharing, then I fully endorse those objectives. However, the National Energy Program is a far cry from ever achieving any of those objectives. The main reasons why the National Energy Program will never fulfil the stated objectives are the ill-conceived foundations upon which the plan is structured.

Borrowing Authority

I would like to mention a few of them. The cornerstone of the National Energy Program is that the government's conception of Canada is one in which the central government controls all economic activity in the country—regional interests in Canada are best administered from Ottawa. It is no accident that both the constitutional crisis regarding patriation of the British North America Act and the energy war are occurring at the same time.

The critical issue in both instances is what kind of a nation Canada is today and what kind of a nation it will be tomorrow. Are we to have strong provinces or are we to have an economy dominated by a central government? If the federal government persists in moving Canada toward a unitary state then this country will not survive. My constituents will not stand by and watch the federal government steal their resources. I am making that abundantly clear now, Mr. Speaker.

If we want a government to control all our energy policy in this country, then let us look at some of the things they have done in the past. In the early 1970s the minister of energy promised oil self-sufficiency by 1980. Today we are importing 500,000 barrels of oil per day. That is Liberal government energy policy for you. We have waited ten years for frontier land regulations. There has been no effort whatsoever to maximize the use of heavy shut-in oil in Alberta. There have been no government initiatives to aid in the use of heavy shut-in oil reserves in Alberta and western Saskatchewan. This may surprise you, Mr. Speaker. Petro-Canada refused to participate in Hibernia. That is Liberal policy for you.

Then we have the great deal with the government of Mexico. We pay higher than world price for a low-grade quality crude. We cannot even refine it because we do not have a refinery which can handle it. Then having made the deal with Mexico, the Mexicans turn around and say that they cannot sell it to us and that they can only give us about 50 per cent of their deliveries. That is Liberal energy policy for you.

The federal government says it must have a far greater share of oil and gas revenues. Yet it is not prepared to recognize the legitimate rights of the provinces. When we are talking of sharing, do we not have to talk about price? What are we sharing? How can you talk intelligently about any sharing program or any percentages if you do not talk about what you are sharing? Let us talk about what price we are sharing. It is claimed by the Liberal government, with their manipulative tactics in the National Energy Program; meant to deceive the Canadian people, that the federal government's share is only 10 per cent, the Alberta government's share is 45 per cent and the industry's share is 45 per cent.

That is 45 per cent of what? And 10 per cent of what? Is it 45 per cent of 41 per cent of the world price? That is what we are talking about. Why do we not talk about a revenue-sharing program based on fair energy prices? What would that produce? Let us not even talk about world price for oil, let us talk about something in the range of 75 per cent or 85 per cent of world oil price. If the province of Alberta and the producers were receiving 75 per cent of world price, the federal government's share of the revenue under the existing formula would