

pointed out, and many on this side have, the result will be the exact opposite of the government's declared intention. Rather than stimulating exploration and the development of these resources with which this industry is concerned, the catch-all legislation now being considered before us, this catch-all measure of state control, will dampen and deaden the industry by destroying initiative and by hampering free enterprise.

It does not stop there. This one small segment of the over-all scheme of the government will bring into being—and we have become very accustomed to this happening with everything this government has been doing in the last 12 years—hordes of additional public functionaries whose job will be to apply the vast incunabulum of regulations which will harass and beset those whose task it is to bring this nation into a state of energy self-sufficiency in the future. Believe me, no one in Canada more than we who live in the north is more familiar with that process. This vast apparatus of government intervention in a highly skilled uncertain area of national development will have the effect of slowing down the stride toward self-sufficiency which was actually begun during the very short time we were in office a little over a year ago.

● (2030)

The difference was that elaborating our policy, we worked with those in the field whose knowledge of operation was not based on theoretical economic considerations or government programming criteria but on hard knowledge of resource development.

I ask the rhetorical question, what consultation did they have with the industry before placing this measure before us? I can tell you there was not one scintilla of consultation or any advice sought from those in the industry and from those in the population generally above the 60th parallel. Its idea of consultation is to make the decision, inform those affected and ask, "Well, what do you think of this?" If these people say they do not like it, that it is not quite right, that is too bad. This is the way it is going to be. That is the government's idea of consultation. That is yet another reason why this measure must be viewed with suspicion as the opening wedge leading to total federal government control over the energy industry in this country.

Already this government's interference in the oil industry, as many members on this side have pointed out, has led to a disastrous flight of capital from the country in the first nine months of 1981. Month by month, week by week, almost daily the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was being bombarded with these statistics. He was brushing them aside. But in the first nine months of 1981, the removal of capital from Canada has reached, not \$8 billion but \$10 billion as a result of measures such as this. This massive outflow, much of it attributed to fear and uncertainty on the part of the oil industry, has threatened the Canadian dollar and has resulted in the postponement of important energy projects, indeed, from what we are told by members representing those areas, the abandonment of one or more of them such as the Cold Lake heavy oil project. These projects are indispensable to

Canada Oil and Gas Act

Canada's future energy plans. They are being deliberately sabotaged by measures such as this.

A second and equally important effect has been to put off all hope of energy self-sufficiency in the foreseeable future. That is massively evident to anyone who does not even know anything about the oil industry, despite the continued assurances of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and others over there. As a matter of fact, because of the ill-timed and blundering interference of the government, there is indeed no foreseeable future.

I believe I have another 15 minutes, Mr. Speaker, but I see you are gesturing toward your watch. I still have time, do I not?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time accorded to members for debate is 20 minutes. I am sure the House would want to grant unanimous consent to the hon. member if he wanted to take a minute to wrap up his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: I thank hon. members for their indulgence. I wanted to continue by saying that the ministers, as I have observed them throughout the discussion of their energy policy, talked glibly, even musically—and I love listening to the minister of energy when he speaks of the National Energy Program—about Canadianization. That is a crock of rhubarb, and you know it over there. What it really is—I would like to be free to speak as a Yukoner here but they expect more of me when I am here than to speak as bluntly as I do at home. What it is is nationalization, nationalization of the industry. That is an interesting word, in the bright lexicon of the Liberal Party, the party which calls itself the Liberal Party. I maintain it lost that status, philosophically, in 1968. However, what Canadianization means is state control. That is what this kind of legislation is aimed at. The government identifies Canadian ownership of resources with ownership by the federal government and management by the Liberal Party. That is how their thought process operates. Canadianization means state control through companies deliberately set up to achieve that objective. For example, there is PetroCan which is staffed by, I could say, Liberal Party hacks, but I do not want to arouse any resentment over there. Their major qualification for sitting on the board of directors of Petro-Canada is subservience to the wishes of the Liberal Party. I could name names, but again I do not want to lower the level of this debate.

An hon. Member: You just did.

Mr. Nielsen: This is clearly understood in the United States where the so-called Canadianization policy is seen for exactly what it is, a policy of government control and intervention worthy of a banana republic without the bananas. The evidence of that is to be seen every day now south of the border in the manner in which our actions are being viewed down there. On this basis, an appropriate campaign song, I would suggest, for the Liberal Party in the next election—the sooner the