

Fuel Consumption Standards

capital. We are not talking about small entrepreneurs or gas station operators here; we are talking about corporations that are completely integrated, from gas pumps to the exploration and support services.

The small entrepreneurs in the oil business—and perhaps the Conservatives hit the nail on the head here—are not just moving, they are being driven out because we do not have a commonsense, safe and secure approach to energy development. Options are being exercised in these non-conventional areas by companies like Imperial Oil.

I have listened to many of my colleagues on the right say what a terrible thing it would be if we took Imperial Oil over. But Mr. Speaker, that would give the Canadian public a greater window on the industry, and more influence in directing the industry in the husbanding and development of that resource. The attitude has always been to let that go in and develop because they have the expertise and they can generate the capital. But all we get from them is the same old routine that we got from them with the development of conventional sources. They said they want to increase the price. They want more tax incentives, more direct contributions from the tax payers. When that was not enough, they said, "Sorry, we are going to shut it down." Ultimately they will want to export it.

● (1950)

We have been on this route before, Mr. Speaker. The unfortunate aspect is that the cycle of energy development, the mistakes and shortsightedness which have brought us to this very sorry state today, are the product of the inactivity of the Liberal government. In the early days we saw Canadian entrepreneurs moving into development of the oil industry with some relative success. From there we moved into a period of takeovers where the multinational oil companies moved in to gain control because the Liberal government ignored the need to protect Canadian consumers and businesses. We now have hit a period of crisis in which the product is in short supply and manipulations occur. Now the Liberal government is moving forward with some fairly drastic changes which could have been brought in before the takeover occurred. The guidelines could have been laid down in the beginning, saying that we want accountability, we want rational development and exploitation of that product for Canadians, not for the multinationals and their shareholders who live in other countries.

It is interesting that for a period of time those multinational corporations in Canada, led by the energy corporations, became an instrument of American government policy working in Canada. That was an unfortunate extraterritorial application of the laws and policies of the U.S. in this country. Not only was the Liberal government abrogating its responsibilities to the people for the protection of their resources but they allowed, by neglect, the American government to impose their law and economic policies in this country. However, we seem to have come to a transition point in the history of our development of energy resources in which the energy companies are spreading out into other areas such as uranium and coal development. I think they probably recognize that the oil

era is passing and there will have to be development in new areas. We see them moving into minerals and other energy sources, but unfortunately we do not seem to be laying down the guidelines there and history is going to repeat itself. We are still stressing this dangerous approach of high priced conventional energy, or these equally dangerous nuclear alternatives. It is time that we took a step beyond that and said that we as Canadians are going to begin to develop and capture a technology based on safe alternative sources of energy and conservation. Ultimately that will mean a safer and more effective energy future for Canadians.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of alternative we want to have to the rather insane and, if you will, stupid energy policy put forward by the Liberal government. There are aspects of it which, on the surface, look okay, such as the goals, but certainly there is no commitment to demand accountability from the energy corporations, there is no commitment to protect the resource for Canadians. Unfortunately, the bill before us does not represent that kind of commitment, and we will not be supporting it for that reason.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Lalonde) which was agreed to on the following division:

● (2000)

(Division No. 168)

YEAS Messrs.		
Allmand	Bockstael	Corriveau
Appolloni	Bossy	Cosgrove
(Mrs.)	Bujold	Côté (Mrs.)
Bachand	Burghardt	Cousineau
Baker	Bussières	Daudlin
(Gander-Twilligate)	Caccia	de Corneille
Beauchamp-Niquet	Campbell	Demers
(Mrs.)	(Miss)	Deniger
Bégin (Miss)	(South West Nova)	Dingwall
Berger	Campbell	Dion
Blais	(Cardigan)	Dubois
Blaker	Chrétien	Duclos
Bloomfield	Collenette	Dupras