

finds has been to expropriate and confiscate some of the action through the back-in. What amuses me the most is the Government's implication that somehow or other it was responsible for the discovery of oil at Norman Wells. In fact, the person who discovered oil at Norman Wells was Sir Alexander MacKenzie nearly 200 years ago.

The Minister has referred to three major initiatives. They are the \$250,000 PGRT tax credit, a reduction in royalties, and the Enhanced Oil Recovery Program. The first allows a corporation an annual credit of up to \$250,000 that may be deducted from the PGRT liability. This was announced in the Government's national energy policy update in 1982. It has been in effect since then. I am pleased to see that it will continue. Another tax measure was a royalty reduction from 16 per cent to 14.67 per cent, effective June 1, 1982 to May 31, 1983. This is a gross rate because the actual rate has dropped from 12 per cent to 11 per cent. This was also announced when the NEP update was tabled well over a year and a half ago. We are today talking about a Bill which puts into place some measures which are no longer even in effect. The last measure I mentioned is the Enhanced Oil Recovery Program announced in the April 19, 1983 Budget, which basically provides for a reduction from income of capital costs in enhanced oil recovery projects.

The Minister has made much of the miniprojects which he says flow from this kind of approach. He failed to comment on the loss of the megaprojects which we were anticipating as engines of growth for the economy before the introduction of the NEP.

I am not here today to argue against the intent of this bill because it does provide royalty relief for corporations. Some of these measures are good measures which my Party has long argued for. What concerns me is that the measures which this Bill touches on deal on the surface only with the problems caused by the Government's National Energy Program. He talks of fiscal dimensions. We talk about the human dimensions of the terrible blows that were suffered in the western sedimentary basin, the collapse of communities, the loss of jobs, the bankruptcies, and the human tragedy which followed the introduction of this policy which I will discuss later.

I would like to give you an overall picture of the state of the industry at the present, just three years after the national energy policy was first introduced. The first goal of the NEP was security of supply or self-sufficiency by 1990. An internal federal study released recently shows that Canada will have a tough time achieving that goal and could remain dependent on imports through to the end of the century. It shows that unless world oil prices climb more quickly than now expected, and offshore production and oil sands projects come onstream sooner than anticipated, Canada might never be self-sufficient in this century except for two brief two-year periods in the mid 1990s. Even that seems unlikely. Another report prepared by the Geological Survey of Canada says that it is unlikely that there will be any significant offshore production in this decade. So much for self-sufficiency.

### *Excise Tax Act*

The second goal referred to is Canadianization. More than 20 years ago the late Prime Minister John Diefenbaker described the rationale for Canadianization. I think it is well worth repeating his words. He said, "Investment in Canada must fully regard Canadian industry, Canadian interests and Canadians' economic destiny." The cost of a Liberal Canadianization program has been the outflow of about \$11.1 billion in the first two years alone after this policy was introduced. A year ago Pitfield Mackay Ross said that the outflow of Canadian capital had reached tidal wave proportions. When the Bank of Canada was defending our dollar with painfully high interest rates the Government was destroying the dollar through so-called Canadianization. This hardly takes into account Canadian industry, Canadian interests or Canada's economic destiny.

The final objective of the national energy policy was fairness. Only 150 days after it was introduced 35,000 jobs had been lost, companies had 25 per cent of their offshore holdings expropriated by the Government, the cost of heating oil more than doubled and Government taxation on gasoline tripled. I wonder how the Liberal Government would define fairness. The Minister says in his speech that fairness is not a partisan issue. We wish to make it a partisan issue because the Government has been unfair.

While we are on the subject of fairness, I would like to discuss the matter of the Canadian ownership charge which is costing each and every energy consumer in this country an average of \$60 a year. This charge was imposed by the Government to subsidize Petro-Canada's purchase of Petrofina. That exorbitant \$1.7 billion price tag has been covered. The Government now says it will not cancel the tax because it has an obligation to bail out Dome Petroleum should Dome want or need that assistance. Dome does not want to touch that program with a 10 foot pole. Still the Government will not drop the charge because it means an additional \$1 billion a year in revenues to feed the ever-growing national debt.

It is obvious that what it really needed is a major overhaul of the punitive aspects of the national energy policy. Before we can get on with the job of taking corrective measures which go well beyond the ones introduced in this Bill, the Government must first admit that it made a mistake. The first step to resolving in issue is to admit openly that there is a problem and to face it realistically. That is something the Government needs to do after 15 years in power.

● (1620)

I did take heart when the Minister responsible for this disastrous legislation stood in the House on January 30 and apologized to the Leader of my Party for unjustly accusing him of advocating tax changes that were advantageous only to the rich, a charge which later proved false. Possibly the Minister should also apologize to the people of Canada for this equally serious energy problem he has created. I expect that the Government knows the extent of its mistake and hopes to hide it from the people of Canada by introducing a flurry of