

Petroleum Incentives Program Act

and the government permitted it to do it. The industry then says that there is a shortage, another crisis, and must go back to the government for more grants or tax breaks. That is a pattern which has been followed in Canada. I challenge any member in the House to argue otherwise historically.

During the early 1970s we exported one half of our daily oil production. What is the energy crisis in Canada today? We have enough hydro, coal and nuclear power. We have enough natural gas but we do not have enough oil.

It is not sufficient for any Conservative members to berate it. Their policy in the Clark government was exactly the same and, as a matter of fact, it was worse. I hope that some Liberal members will stand up to take part in this debate—now that they are all here—to say how the policy announced by the Clark government was worse.

I do not want to have to give the facts and figures because that is up to the Liberal members, but I can tell them where to find those facts. The Liberal policy is bad enough but the Conservative policy was worse. Hon. members can call me names but I suggest they look at the figures and at what the Crosbie budget proposed and what the deal with Alberta was, if there was one.

Mr. Domm: You do not even know.

Mr. Waddell: I suggest that those members review the convention resolution where the member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) and, I believe, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) took the position that the price should be 85 per cent of world prices.

Mr. Taylor: Since when was a resolution a law?

Mr. Waddell: A resolution of a Tory convention is never law. Nevertheless it was there. What I am suggesting is that we review this Canadianization policy in detail. I propose a much simpler and more effective way to achieve Canadianization. Instead of putting \$6.5 billion into a convoluted scheme, as the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) pointed out very well in his speech, we should take that \$6.5 billion and give it to Petro-Canada to buy Imperial Oil. In this way we will get 15 per cent more Canadian ownership and no blackmail from the industry.

An hon. Member: Where will you borrow the money?

Mr. Waddell: The money is coming in. The government is just about to give \$6.5 billion in grants. That is where it will come from. If you take that money to buy Imperial Oil there will be no need for PIP, COR or any other layer of bureaucracy.

We are not suggesting a take-over of the whole industry but that we should take a leading direction similar to that of Norway, Great Britain and many other countries. Those countries have indicated that in the tough world of international oil—not just a small company but the seven sisters—you must have a directing force, and this must be the predominant role of Petro-Canada.

You can ask anyone who has experience in the international realm of the oil companies. You can ask that of Bill Hopper. I

believe that a policy such as that would make sense. Since it would not cost \$6.5 billion to purchase Imperial Oil, you could invest the remainder of the money in conservation and alternate energy. That is where our energy security lies.

During recent debates we discovered that \$6,500 million, that is \$6.5 billion, will go to the oil companies over five years as a result of this bill. However, \$35 million will go to Canertech, the government's energy corporation in Winnipeg. When we see that imbalance, if more money were put into conservation and energy alternatives instead of going to megaprojects through giveaways and blackmail, we could create more jobs and achieve real energy security for Canada.

Perhaps you have read the words of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn when he said that it must be obvious to any village greybeard that a dozen worms can only gnaw at one apple for so long until it is all gone. I see my friend laughing, but I believe it is a very philosophical and intelligent statement. What Solzhenitsyn was saying was that we cannot keep using renewable resources or they will go. Canadians understand that.

● (2010)

As the minister said today in reply to a question from the hon. member for Calgary Centre in this House, there have been some successes in the NEP, one of them being that people are starting to conserve. They understand and they will conserve. With this \$6.5 billion we could set up neighbourhood energy programs modelled after programs with which we have experience, such as the Neighbourhood Improvement Program, of a few years ago, under which local citizens improved their neighbourhoods. That was a program of this government. It was a successful program. It worked, and it would work on a neighbourhood level for energy. We could get some real conservation.

The government would then not have to give \$8 billion to Shell to delay another month on the tar sands or \$40 million to Imperial Oil to delay a few months on Cold Lake. It would not have to put \$13 billion into this consortium to develop the tar sands which private industry will not touch. It would not have to do that. It would not have to put \$60 billion into the Alaska pipeline.

There is another way of doing this. I am not saying that conventional oil cannot be developed. We must develop that. I would suggest we must go to Hibernia. I think the government is smart in earmarking Hibernia for development. I know there are tremendous technological problems, but there is oil out there which we can use and which we need. I am not saying we do not need oil. What I am saying is that we do not have to give \$6.5 billion to Dome Petroleum and Nova for oil.

There was an interview of Jack Gallagher, the chairman of Dome Petroleum, on "The Journal" program. It was a most revealing interview in which Mr. Gallagher said, "We will develop the oil," and he will be one of the biggest recipients of these grants. He said, "We will develop the Beaufort Sea." He