

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

with the present overbearing approach that you are trying to take at the moment.

**Mr. Paproski:** Get rid of Marc Lalonde!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Would the hon. member please address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. This whole policy directs itself toward state ownership. It does not even provide opportunities to private Canadians to own more, it is for the state to own more. I want to read into the record two quotations for the benefit of my friends on the left, that noisy class, the political nymphomaniacs who are so anxious to jump into bed with the government majority. Here is what one of their former leaders, Mr. Tommy Douglas said in 1960, 20 years before he became a director of Husky Oil. This is what he said then:

It's possible to plan an economy without owning it.

I wish the neophytes on my left would understand that. You can plan the economy, you do not need to own it. Why do we want to own all the oil and gas companies in Canada and use tens of billions of dollars to buy assets which are already here in Canada. The assets are already here. We do not need to buy them. We control them anyway. Imperial Oil had to say they have to bow to the government. No one is mightier than Imperial Oil, yet it has to bow to the government. We do not need to own its assets. What we want to do is spend tens of billions of dollars creating new assets in Canada in the frontier areas, in the Beaufort Sea and off Newfoundland. We need to develop the heavy oils and the tar sands. The amount needed is \$1.4 trillion over the next 20 years, according to the Royal Bank, of which we have to get \$300 billion from outside of Canada. This is about \$16 billion a year. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of policy is the way to get \$16 billion a year from outside of Canada? I say, some hope! You can forget altogether what you are trying to get from within Canada.

To come back to Tommy Douglas, Tommy Douglas was good back in 1960. He was sensible. He was a rational socialist; a contradiction in terms. But in 1971 he was just as sensible. In a discussion on the transfer of power to the federal bureaucracy from the provinces, he said the following in 1971:

Canadians do not want to escape from the clutches of big business only to fall into the clutches of big government.

Could anything be more sensible? Both of those principles, gentlemen and ladies on my left, are being violated by this document which is before the House tonight, and the others that will come in. The leader of that party is out. He is spouting the most errant nonsense. Thank God he is not doing it in the House. We have enough to fear here without fearing his foolishness in the House about buying up the three largest oil and gas companies and not paying them what the value is, just pay them what we say they are worth, and so on. That is the end of Canada as a repository for any investment from outside of this country. I recommend Tommy Douglas to you. I say, forget Mr. Broadbent. He is passé. Go back to reading

Tommy Douglas and perhaps get some sense. We hope that you might have some sense.

I will not give just myself as an authority for some of these statements. I have dozens of other authorities I can offer. On December 13, 1981, in *The Globe and Mail* we can see the effect of this policy by reading the following under the heading "Alberta fears revenue losses":

The Alberta government could lose more than \$400 million in provincial revenue from the sale of oil and gas licences next year—

The "Sale of exploration rights drops by almost half in Saskatchewan". That is the socialist paradise. It has had the boots put to it by this policy. Mr. Broadbent crawls on his hands and knees to try to get a little concession from the Prime Minister when he should be fighting for the rights of Saskatchewan. We read in *The Globe and Mail* of December 13 the following:

New federal taxes are unbearable for operating companies in Saskatchewan, where oil well production rates are lower than in other provinces, he said.

Who said that? It was the mineral resources minister John Messer. Who is he, hon. members might ask. He is an NDP minister in Saskatchewan. That is what he said, and the gentlemen here are supporting that kind of action in Saskatchewan. On this same page of *The Globe and Mail* for December 13 under the heading "B.C. oil, gas leases cut", we read:

Profit from the B.C. government's next sale of oil and gas rights will be drastically reduced because of the federal government's threat to impose resource development taxes—

That is just one example of the tremendous damage.

In another magazine, the *Executive*, Peter Cook, an economist, has written an article. I am being kind to the Minister of Finance and his budget compared to this impartial article in *Executive* magazine for December, 1980. What does Mr. Cook say? In part, his article reads:

What the government has clearly done is to create greater uncertainty about where the economy is headed in the next 18 months, and not just for the oil and gas industry. MacEachen has also, through his energy measures and tax changes, managed to push back the recovery from recession and promote inflation in the period ahead.

That is no John Crosbie. Some people might say I am partisan. I am not, but someone might say it. This is the impartial writer of this article. We read on:

The toughness and universality of the MacEachen measures will act as a further restraint on the consumer sector.

Hon. members might ask why. It is because no tax credits were provided to cushion the impact of rising energy prices for low-income families such as I proposed. Where is the member for Kitchener when he can learn something? He has scuttled off to the scullery somewhere, but he will not learn much there. The article continues:

The effect of the MacEachen budget has been to knock 0.5 per cent off growth in the economy for the whole year, bringing it down to the finance minister's own forecast figure of just 1 per cent.

The shock effect of food and energy prices will push the Consumer Price Index ahead by 11 per cent in 1981 (without the MacEachen energy and tax changes, the rate would have been 10 per cent).