

Canada Petroleum Resources Act

In her statement the Minister said that the Progressive Conservative Party has always supported the goals of the National Energy Program, the goals of opportunity, fairness and energy security. What opportunity is there for Canadian companies when the Minister takes away all the incentives they were given and gives them to the multinationals who, rather than drilling, will sit on the reserves of leases they have until the price of oil and gas goes up again? They are not interested in the security of supply or the energy future of the country. What fairness is there when the Minister retroactively takes away the drilling rights which Canadian companies had under their drilling plans filed with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and retroactively reduces the number of wells which they can drill? What energy security is there when the Minister takes away the incentive to drill in the off-shore and other frontier areas?

The Minister reneged on giving a loan guarantee for the Husky upgraders in Saskatchewan and Alberta. What kind of security of supply does that provide for? What kind of security of supply can there be when the Government does nothing to stabilize the energy sector in western Canada, the downturn of which is costing jobs for hundreds of western Canadians and many other Canadians as well? In the long-term that will damage the economy of this country which we have moulded and fostered for so many years.

The Minister said:

In a very constructive reaction to the NEP policies of the previous Government the Progressive Conservative Party caucus released its energy policy principles at Prince Albert in July of 1984, and again in Halifax in August of that year.

She said that one of them was energy resource development as an engine for economic growth. We all heard about the Minister's statement with regard to the engine of our economic growth. She was going to create 100,000 to 300,000 jobs depending upon which day she was making the statement. We were heartened to hear that the Minister believed that she was going to do something for the energy sector in the country. What is the Minister now doing for the energy sector? She has completely backed away from the problems of the energy sector on the frontiers and in western Canada. She has completely forgotten about the commitments she made to Canadians with regard to the development of the energy sector. She made a complete mockery of the commitment to energy resource development as an engine for economic growth.

The second thing proposed by the P.C. Party at Prince Albert and Halifax was energy self-sufficiency. The Government literally abandoned the Husky up-grader. It completely backed away from the problems in western Canada and the dire needs with regard to the tar sands and heavy oil. It has allowed the producers to be gouged by the major oil companies. It has allowed major oil companies to pay producers \$3 to \$6 less for a barrel of oil than comparable producers get in the United States. Producers in this country are being paid the lowest price in the world for their product. What does this add to energy self-sufficiency?

Increased Canadian participation was the third principle enunciated in Prince Albert and Halifax. The Minister has decreased the incentive of companies in the off-shore not paying tax from 80 per cent to 10 per cent. The incentive of tax-paying Canadian companies has been decreased from 90 per cent to 25 per cent. That is not increasing, but decreasing Canadian participation. The first three principles enunciated in Prince Albert and Halifax have been completely jettisoned, trampled and spat upon.

● (1530)

What about the fourth one? It states that there will be fair treatment for energy producers and consumers. That may be the most ludicrous and hypocritical statement yet. Where is the fair treatment? I have already said that Canadian producers are getting the lowest price in the world for their product. This is encouraged by the Government through the policies of PetroCan. The Parliamentary Secretary said that the Government put a new policy in effect for PetroCan by encouraging it to make money. It is also encouraging the company to gouge the consumer. Canadians are paying a higher price for gasoline than Americans. That has been going on since January. We have been told that there is a flow-through period of 60 to 90 days. Try and tell that to someone who knows the truth. Try and tell that to someone in Alberta who sees the oil going through the refinery and out to the retailers.

This is a very sad situation because people trusted the Tories. That is why they voted them in on September 4, 1984, with such a large majority. They trusted them to do what they said they would, particularly on those four points. The Minister said that Canadians were presented with a choice on energy policy during the election. She said that they voted for a new approach and an end to the National Energy Program. They did not necessarily vote for an end to the NEP *per se*. They voted for change, yes, but they did not tell the Conservatives to come up with a policy, run an election campaign on that policy, and then completely ignore it once they became the Government.

The Minister said that the energy initiatives the Government has taken to date in the Atlantic and Western Accords, and the measures which were announced at the end of October, 1985, marked the end of the NEP and its replacement by a fair, non-discriminatory and constructive Conservative energy policy. I think we are getting down to the nub of this energy policy. It is built around one thing: the Minister and her Government wanted to do away with the NEP. They became apoplectic any time someone mentioned the National Energy Program. They did not care what they did. They did not care about the damage they inflicted on the producer or the consumer. All they wanted to do was to get rid of the NEP. Through the legislation they have put forward, they will get rid of the NEP. They will also get rid of a lot of things the Canadian people were pleased to have, things such as conservation and producer and consumer protection, things they now wish they had.