

General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 26th day of November, at 5 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to a bill.

I have the honour to be,  
Madam,  
Your obedient servant,  
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière  
Administrative Secretary  
to the Governor General

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION ACT

#### PETITION TO REVOKE PROCLAMATION

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway)** moved:

That the proclamation laid before the House on Wednesday, November 12, 1980, pursuant to subsection 52(3) of the Petroleum Administration Act, as proclaimed in PC 1980-2917, be revoked.

He said: Madam Speaker, first a word of explanation in order to clarify this matter. Earlier, I moved that the order in council with relation to the fixing unilaterally of oil prices by the federal government be challenged and be revoked. This motion deals with the fixing of gas prices, but essentially it concerns the same act, the Petroleum Administration Act.

I should like to begin by making the position of my party very clear on this issue respecting both oil and gas. We say that the national energy program brought before the House when the budget came down is basically flawed; it is a flawed program. In time people, especially progressive people, will find more and more things to criticize in this program.

We feel there are two major flaws in it. The first arises through the government's failure to introduce an industrial strategy or economic restructuring of the economy either in the budget or the national energy program. Later on I will talk about the fact that there has not been any industrial strategy at all. When I say "industrial strategy", I mean making Canada a country which manufactures at home its own resources, instead of being a shipper of raw resources or a vast mine for foreign countries.

● (1550)

Such a move requires real industrial strategy, planning, concern and commitment. My party is committed, but apparently the government is not. I will be discussing that matter in more detail later in my speech. The second major flaw in the national energy program and the budget is that there is no cushion in the form of subsidies on the impact of higher energy prices on low and middle-income people. Canadians will come to realize very shortly that as the price of gasoline and heating oil begins to rise many segments of the population will need help to pay the higher prices. They will not receive that help from the government.

The third flaw is that the Petroleum Administration Act, this Draconian measure, has been invoked too early. My party would prefer to get back to the original principle of co-opera-

### *Petroleum Administration Act*

tive federalism and obtain agreement with the provinces. Instead, the federal government is unilaterally invoking this serious act. I would like to quote from a speech made during the debate on the Petroleum Administration Act in this House on October 31, 1974, by the Hon. Donald Macdonald, the then minister of energy, as reported in *Hansard* at page 914:

While it is the government's earnest hope and desire that the price of oil from the producer provinces will always be determined at mutually-acceptable levels by agreement with those provinces—

The government is most hopeful that the exercise of such powers will not be required.

The minister was referring to the powers of oil price restraint, and saying that he hoped these powers would not be invoked, that, instead, there would be agreement. Alberta has not acted unilaterally in this matter without the permission of the minister. I have no brief with respect to the claims of Alberta. Personally, I believe it is wrong that so much wealth should be concentrated in one province. Nor do I have a brief with respect to Alberta's actions since the budget and since the invocation of this act. By that I am referring to Premier Lougheed's announcement that he would cut production. Such a move is bad for Canada and bad for Alberta. I do not have any sympathy at all with the recently announced private boycott by Alberta businessmen on Ontario goods. It is wrong and shortsighted. The government did not have to invoke this act. The government could have continued on with the price regime which had been *de facto* agreed upon, and the minister admitted as much in the House just the other day. There was no dispute of that price regime by Premier Lougheed.

The government could have merely set out the limits of its tolerance in terms of price increases by Alberta. If Alberta overstepped those limits, then the Petroleum Administration Act could have been invoked for good reason. My party is not against the act in principle, but we would prefer to see it used as an emergency measure when all else fails. If the government could not get agreement with the producing provinces, then it would be required to act unilaterally and invoke the Petroleum Administration Act, but only in cases where the action by a province would have a drastic effect on oil prices or on the principles of co-operative federalism. The act should only be invoked along with a very progressive policy which is fair and can be seen to be fair in all areas of the country. Such is not the case now.

Many of my colleagues have indicated in the House that the budget and the energy policy of the government are not fair to the north, to Atlantic Canada or to western Canada. It seems to me that Canada has the worst of all possible worlds. It has higher oil prices, angry provinces, no cushions or help for the lower or middle-income people and no future job strategy for the country.

As a Canadian who lives in western Canada, I would like to say a few words about the alienation of that part of the country. This topic has been very much a part of the debate and part of the news of late. By invoking the Petroleum Administration Act the federal government is seizing revenues from western resources. It is seizing a larger share of oil and gas revenues. If one were to approach this matter logically one