

Nigeria \$36.71 a barrel, Iran \$35 a barrel, Ecuador \$36 a barrel, Kuwait \$29 a barrel, Qatar \$31 a barrel, Iraq \$30 a barrel, Libya \$36 a barrel, Indonesia \$31 a barrel, Algeria \$35 a barrel and Venezuela \$31 a barrel. A cartel refers to groups joined together to establish a fixed price on a commodity.

It is also interesting to note that there are many other countries which are not members of OPEC but which have prices just as high. I cite Great Britain which is self-sufficient in North Sea oil. There is also West Germany and other countries around the world which have oil prices just as high, but which are not dependent upon an oil supply from an OPEC country. The question as to whether the oil price today is led by OPEC or whether it is a world commodity price is a question we must ponder.

As long as we continue to say that we are being gulped up by OPEC, then surely there will be a greater division in the country, particularly in view of the fact that the western premiers have said they are not after the world price, but after a certain percentage of what is the world commodity price. That is an entirely different factor when one refers to an international cartel that sells at one price. We have countries outside OPEC like Great Britain and West Germany which charge prices that are equally as high.

We also have situations where, for example, in Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, it takes one barrel of oil to recover two barrels. In other words, for every three barrels of oil, one barrel is required to bring the other two up, or 30 per cent of the energy brought up is required to bring the oil up. I am referring to a secondary recovery system which requires steam for heat and hot brine to loosen the oil from the tertiary formation in order to bring it up.

I plead with all members to acquire an understanding of this industry and the great potential it offers Canada. There is no nation which has the blessed fortunes of this land and all the resources; its human capacity, its forestry, its fisheries, its minerals or its energy. We have a great supply of this form of energy, but we must be willing to pay the cost to get it into the Canadian market. This in turn will create Canadian jobs, particularly in the Canadian pipe industry. It will save us from paying the world price and put us at a competitive advantage in the world.

However, if we choose to take this projected \$8.5 billion out of Canada by 1985 and send it to Mexico, Venezuela or the Middle East and not create a single job or employ a single Canadian—or a married one for that matter—then surely it does not in any way behoove us as a nation to take the position that that kind of throwing away of our money is of any standard that in this country should be looked upon—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Mr. Speaker, I will begin my remarks and call it ten o'clock in a moment. It is difficult to know just how to begin debate on a bill now, after having read the column by Doug Small the other day in which he referred to the conventional, "I welcome this oppor-

tunity to participate in this debate". Members of Parliament will have to find a new introduction.

This particular bill is to give authority to the government to borrow \$12 billion, or as an hon. member mentioned earlier this evening, "\$12 billion toward a blank cheque government". What we must look at is when was this blank cheque government introduced to Canada. It was introduced in 1969 when one of the first acts of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was to change the rules of the House of Commons in dealing with parliamentary expenditures. The last thing he wanted was any proper scrutiny over expenditures. Ever since then we have had blank cheque government in this country.

The philosophy of the Liberal government today is that the only solution to any problem is to print more money, spend more money and borrow more money. Any members who use the phrase blank cheque government certainly know what they were talking about. Canadians are still paying for this rule change introduced by the present Prime Minister. He could not wait to get into this House to change the rules so that we would not know where the tax dollars were being spent. As an hon. member mentioned earlier, the Auditor General cannot find out where half the money is going. This government has something like a \$52 billion budget, and the Auditor General can only account for half of that. I want to call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker, but I will be back tomorrow afternoon.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) if we will be continuing with this delightful exercise tomorrow?

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we shall proceed with Bills C-28, C-19 and C-3, in that order.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

● (2200)

[English]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—SOVIET UNION—REPORTED REINSTATEMENT OF CULTURAL SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Anderson, the alternate candidate I guess