

Senator Argue: I should now like to refer to certain parts of the table. I would mention first the Province of Saskatchewan and the cost involved for a homeowner, using an average amount of natural gas under the prices projected by the national energy policy and under the projected world prices for natural gas in 1984. The table shows that under world prices, supported by Premier Lougheed and Premier Blakeney, the cost of natural gas for the homeowner would be \$1,255. Under the national energy policy, the cost would be \$615, or a saving to a homeowner in the Province of Saskatchewan in 1984, using natural gas, of \$640.

I am told that while the figures would be somewhat different in another province, there is not that much difference, that in the Province of Alberta you would probably be within 1 or 2 per cent of precisely the same figures.

So when Mr. Lougheed talks about world energy prices, let us bear in mind that those prices will mean a penalty for every homeowner using natural gas in Alberta and Saskatchewan—and, indeed, throughout Canada—of between \$600 and \$700 per year.

For a person using home heating oil—960 gallons is said to be the average consumption—the cost would be \$2,073 at OPEC prices, and \$1,382 national energy policy prices, a saving of \$691.

For a motorist using 1,000 gallons of gas a year—that is perhaps 20,000 miles, depending on the type of car—the cost is \$2,960 at world prices, and \$2,070 at national energy policy prices, a saving of \$890 in driving his car in 1984.

A farmer using 3,000 gallons of diesel fuel would pay, under OPEC, \$7,680, and under the national energy policy—under the Trudeau energy policy, under the Liberal energy policy—\$4,866, a saving of \$2,820.

A farmer who uses 3,000 gallons of purple gas—that is the gas that he can burn in his trucks and on which there is no road tax applied—would pay \$8,250 under the OPEC prices, and \$5,580 under national energy policy prices, a saving of \$2,670.

If honourable senators add up all of those savings they will see that as a homeowner, as an automobile driver, and as a user of diesel fuel and purple farm gas, the Saskatchewan farmer, under the Trudeau policy and not the Blakeney policy, will save over \$7,000 in 1984. I say from the floor of the Senate that it is in the interest of the Saskatchewan farmers, homeowners and business people to support a national energy policy that says there should be reasonable prices to the consumer, and that those prices should not be at the OPEC international level. We do not have to have the cartel level. We

[Senator Argue.]

do not have to have the cartel getting \$40 a barrel for light crude that was brought into production at a profit of \$2 per barrel. We do not need that. We do not need to rip off Canadians, to give it away to the multinational oil companies, or to give the incomes of Canadians into the hands of a few multinational oil companies or one province.

I have seen the projection that if nothing is changed, and the present trend continues, within five years the big multinational oil companies and one province will have under their control 60 per cent of all the investment capital in this country. It is projected that the Lougheed government will be getting, under the federal policy, up to 1990 and beyond, as much as \$100 billion. Up until 1984, western provinces will get \$40 billion.

I do not think they need to get additional tens of billions of dollars at the expense of consumers and average Canadians. And if that great wealth is in the hands of Alberta and Saskatchewan, are we going to go to those wealthy provinces when we need an increase in the old age pension and say, "Please will you give us an increase in the old age pension?" If we need something for medicare, are we going to go to the provinces that have all the wealth and ask them for it? No. I believe it is fair that we should have a Canadian policy where there is a reasonable distribution of this wealth.

Let us consider the owner of a business—and I will admit that it is a pretty arbitrary business. It might be reasonable if I said that a businessman in heating his premises uses twice the quantity of natural gas that he uses to heat his home, and that instead of one car he drives two cars. So it is a pretty small business. He would save \$1,280 per year.

A man who owns a diesel truck, and keeps it on the road steadily and uses 24,000 gallons of diesel fuel in a year, would save \$22,560 under the national energy policy—I repeat, \$22,560. The reason why a diesel truck owner would need so much more than a farmer is because his truck operates virtually every day of the year; it has a big motor and it consumes perhaps 10 gallons per hour. When it is on the road with a large load it just burns up diesel fuel and, from our inquiries, 24,000 gallons is approximately the quantity of fuel that a big transport truck normally uses in the course of a year.

Senator Frith: What is his percentage of saving?

• (1600)

Senator Argue: The cost is \$2.82 a gallon under OPEC prices, and \$1.88 per gallon under national energy policy prices. So that is a saving of close to a dollar—a 35 per cent saving. That is a very major saving.

I am perfectly happy, therefore, based on this evidence, to take my position on the side of the Trudeau policy, the Lalonde policy, the Liberal government policy, the Government of Canada policy. It is a policy preferable to those followed by certain premiers advocating that the world price should be paid by all Canadians.

We are in a constitutional fight, and we are in a fight over energy policy. We surely know that. We really know that, too, in western Canada. We know who is on the side of the