

*Supply*

• (1120)

Instead of the producers and builders running their operations, generating wealth and maintaining jobs, they must come to Ottawa cap in hand and wait for a decision. They have to wait for the next bureaucratic edict, tax policy or royalty policy to be espoused. The cost has been crushing to business, particularly those businesses associated with the energy sector, as a result of the National Energy Program.

The National Energy Program, with its attack on the oil sector and its discrimination against the domestic and foreign investor, has created a disaster in this country. It still continues to be the Liberal policy. It has destroyed the service and supply sector in western Canada. Some 20,000 to 30,000 jobs have been lost. Only 30 per cent of the rig fleet is working today. Every well that is being drilled creates 692 man-days of work. There have been bankruptcies, not of large businesses but of small Canadian businesses.

What this Government has overlooked is that every dollar spent in the energy sector in western Canada generates two dollars worth of activity in other places. Of every dollar spent in Alberta, 42 cents ends up in Ontario, 15 cents in Quebec, 29 cents in Alberta and 14 cents in other Provinces.

We could not find fault with the fundamental objectives of the National Energy Program; it is the manner in which the implementation took place. There was to be fairness in revenue sharing, acceleration of the Canadianization of the oil and gas industry and oil self-sufficiency by 1990. The Government however was basically aiming at extracting the highest possible federal revenue that it could and imposing an increased Canadian ownership and Government control upon an industry which was tantamount to nationalization.

We have not achieved the goal of self-sufficiency and we have not achieved a fair pricing regime. Our gasoline prices at the pump are higher than in the United States. This is particularly true with regard to agriculture. Every time a farmer fills his tractor, 65 cents per gallon goes into Government coffers.

It has not attacked the multinationals, as was suggested it would. A recent edition of *Oilweek* magazine indicates that the net income for foreign-controlled companies declined by 11 per cent. By the same token, the income of Canadian companies declined by 37 per cent.

What is very disturbing as well is that it was a calculated decision to shift the exploration of oil from the conventional area to the frontier and offshore. A recent example is Petro-Can spending \$70 million on a dry hole drilled off the coast of Nova Scotia. They did not use a Canadian rig but a Norwegian rig. With that amount of money, 240 gas wells or 98 oil wells could have been drilled in the sedimentary basin. Either of those projects would have created 38,000 man-days of employment.

The result of generation of a huge bureaucracy, which is costing about \$1.5 billion, is that we now have three accountants for one working geologist whereas before the NEP we had one accountant for three geologists. We have a situation where

the bottom line is simply that the NEP has been a massive failure. There is no other way in which it can be described.

What is more disturbing is that this Government wants to repeat this tragedy and penetrate its influence further in other areas. I refer to agriculture. Canagrex is the monstrous equivalent of the National Energy Program. It will probably lead to the establishment of five-year plans where Canadian farmers will have to check with Ottawa before deciding what to seed, how much fertilizer they will require and how much weed spray they should buy. There will probably be supermarkets. This proposal is a step in the wrong direction. When will we learn from the experiences of the past?

A new feed grains policy is being drafted. It, too, will put more power and influence in the hands of the livestock feed board and the Minister responsible. The new western rail policy provides for additional powers, more centralization of power in the hands of the Minister.

• (1125)

There is a debate now going on about the fishing sector. I suspect that the Government will probably espouse the formation of a Crown corporation that will take over the fishing sector.

**Mr. Epp:** We will have to blame Canagrex for that.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** My hon. colleague says that we will have to blame Canagrex for that. The Government wants control over the news media.

The emergency planning order has not been brought to the House for debate. It has been imposed simply through regulation, and in times of real or apprehended emergencies the Government can take total control of the economy. It can invoke censorship and suspend civil liberties. It will take over all of these things, Sir, from basic civil liberties to the whole of the economy.

The November, 1981 budget really was the most anti-business, anti-investment and anti-growth budget that has ever been delivered in the House. Thank God that, through the efforts of the Opposition and others, there has been a retraction of that budget. But the latest budget is really no better. The Government has indicated that the new budget will use the private sector as the main engine for recovery. The Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) masquerade by saying that they are the great defenders and supporters of the private sector. Yet looking at their policies they are really espousing more and more state Government control.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, seven years ago 36 per cent of Canadians polled saw big labour as the biggest threat to Canada's future; 29 per cent named big Government and 20 per cent named big business as the biggest threat to Canada's future. This November that same poll shows that 50 per cent of Canadian people believe that the federal Government's influence on their way of life is too great.