

Petro-Canada Act

Where is it in this bill that gives Petro-Canada power or directs Petro-Canada to be the predominant oil company in the oil industry?

Mr. Lalonde: That is what we are doing.

Mr. Waddell: That is not what you are doing at all. You are Canadianizing by giving \$6.5 billion in PIP grants. That is the Liberal Canadianization program.

Mr. Lalonde: You voted against that bill?

Mr. Waddell: In a poll conducted by Gallup on this very question, 64 per cent of Canadians favoured the goal of 75 per cent Canadian ownership by 1985, and 23 per cent were opposed. So Canadians want more Canadian ownership. On government takeover of one of the big four, 55 per cent said yes and 28 per cent said no. So Canadians are way ahead of their government and they are miles ahead of the official opposition. Instead, the government gives us these complicated, unworkable, inequitable, bureaucratic COR and PIP programs.

If the government were really interested in energy security, I would submit, and it is reflected in this bill, the government could look more at the demand side, that is, look to conservation and alternative energy.

The Russian writer, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, once said that any gravedigger in the Ukraine could tell you that 12 worms would only gnaw one apple for so long. We are dealing with these non-renewable resources in oil and gas. If we had the wisdom of those village gravediggers, we would get into conservation and into alternatives in a big way.

I was listening, Mr. Speaker, while the minister was speaking and I noted he defended the Canertech. I may be wrong in what I heard him say, and I will no doubt be corrected if I am by the next speaker for the Liberal party, but it appeared to me that he was saying that Canertech had received \$20 million and that it is the government's alternative energy corporation.

Mr. Lalonde: And another \$35 million.

Mr. Waddell: And additional capital up to \$35 million. Compare that with what Petro-Canada is being given, \$500 million in authorized capital, going up to \$5,500 million. It does indicate, in a rough way—

Mr. Lalonde: You are against it?

Mr. Waddell: The minister says I am against it. I would like him to listen to the point I am making. The point I am trying to make is that perhaps we are spending too much, or we are weighing it too heavily on the supply side, that is, going out and finding oil and gas, when we could be spending some more money on the demand side, and at times, too, on the conservation side. The minister and the government were told the same thing by an all-party committee. My colleague, the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose), will speak again on this matter, when his turn comes to speak, and no doubt he will give a much more witty speech than mine on the value of conservation.

I should tell the minister that a study by the Peace Research Institute showed that Canada's energy effectiveness ratio, that is, its total primary energy in relation to gross national product, is the poorest amongst the OECD countries and that we have the most dismal record in real energy conservation. I should say that it is improving, and we are all glad of that. The study says that Canada has merely slowed down rather than eliminated the waste; and that a massive program of conservation and efficiency and genuine commitment to renewable energy sources is needed if we are to reduce demand in striving to achieve energy self-sufficiency. So says the study.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we cannot have an acceptable level of economic growth of over 3 per cent a year and an energy growth of 2 per cent a year.

A study conducted by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the minister's own department, predicts that if an energy demand of 2 per cent is obtained by 1990, Canada would be saving energy equivalent to the combined annual output of five Syncrude-sized oil sands plants, plus 20 per cent of total annual gas production in 1985, plus 13 Pickering-sized nuclear plants, plus 8.5 million tons of coal.

Some energy experts say, Mr. Speaker, that we can achieve this with only modest adjustments to our lifestyle. Such adjustments include adopting more rigorous fuel mileage standards for automobiles. We will have something to say about that when that bill comes up, it will be one of the future bills that we will be debating. We could have the adjustment also of promoting a more extensive insulating program to make buildings air tight and providing more incentives to reduce waste in industry.

Again I would draw the attention of the minister to the discrepancy in figures in this bill for what is provided for the alternative energy corporation, as compared with what is provided to Petro-Canada to go out and find more oil. I do not object to Petro-Canada going out and exploring. I want to say, however, in response to the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), that my experience of Petro-Canada is that it is staffed by some excellent people, who, thank God, are working for a Canadian corporation and for the Canadian public, rather than working for corporations whose parents are in Pittsburg and New York, directing the show. I think that is a good thing, and that young engineers and young people in the oil business are going to work for people who will pay them a good salary. I think what the member for Calgary West was spouting is nonsense.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that real energy security demands predominant public control through Petro-Canada. That is not what we are given. Real energy security means substantial emphasis on conservation. It means taking some of that \$6.5 billion now earmarked as giveaway grants to private oil companies and putting it into Petro-Canada to take one of the majors under public control.