

Adjournment Debate

Oil has only 22 per cent Canadian ownership; Shell Canada, 26 per cent; Gulf Canada, 26 per cent and Texaco Canada, 9 per cent. I ask, therefore, where did the profits go? I want to make reference to this matter, and I shall be very precise. The net income of these four companies, after income taxes, in 1977 totalled just over \$2 billion. In 1978 it went to \$2,285 million, and in 1979 it went to \$3,525 million. Of that amount, in the three years about which I am talking, 1977, 1978 and 1979, the federal government took in \$825 million; \$735 million and \$766 million respectively. The amounts that went to the provinces were as follows: in 1977, \$2,985 million; in 1978, \$3,357 million and in 1979, \$4,076 million. I think it is time we called a halt to this. There was an increase of 27.6 per cent in the profit of Imperial Oil for the year ended December 31, 1980, over the previous year. This did not include a one-time increase in cash profits amounting to some \$81 million.

● (2215)

It is interesting that the foreign-owned multinationals are starting to make a move. Canadianization is no longer in doubt. Gulf Canada submitted a report proposing three alternative Canadianization schemes. Shell Oil is negotiating with two medium-sized Canadian companies to form a new consortium. Mobil, similarly, is negotiating with two Canadian companies to bring off the same deal as Shell.

The decision to go after and take over Petrofina was made by the board of directors and management of Petro-Canada. The negotiations were carried out on a business basis by the management of Petro-Canada, and the government has approved the takeover. I sincerely applaud the government's initiatives. I look forward to receiving my Petro-Canada gas credit card at an early date so that I can leave the profit on Canada's immense natural resources in Canada.

Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has so well comprehended the government's policy of Canadianization in the petroleum sector that there is little that I need add.

I should, however, take this brief opportunity to draw attention to the Canadianization goals in the national energy policy, goals which were set forth against the background of foreign ownership in our petroleum industry which has been much greater than in other industrialized countries.

The National Energy Program identifies a greater Canadian ownership and control in the petroleum industry as a principal goal. It holds out the expectation that from Canadianization a yet more dynamic energy sector will emerge, one more responsive to Canada's broad national goals. More specifically, the program looks toward 50 per cent Canadian ownership of oil and gas production by 1990; Canadian control of a significant number of larger oil petroleum companies and an early increase in the share of the petroleum sector owned by the Government of Canada.

As the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) has suggested, the popularity of the Canadianization program

cannot be in any doubt. The evidence is ample, whether it be in the form of opinion surveys or simply in the form of the increased customer demand at existing Petro-Canada stations in western Canada. I want also to draw attention, as the hon. member has just done, to the fact that in the purchase of Petrofina, Petro-Canada has acquired a company with assets that fit in particularly well with its present activities and which, when integrated, will help to ensure that we have a truly national, viable state oil company.

FISHERIES—REGULATION OF HERRING FISHING ON WEST COAST

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I rose in my place to ask the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc) questions about the herring roe fishing policy that he was implementing this year on the west coast.

Until now I have had a great deal of respect for the answers the minister has given when he has been asked about fishing policy in Canada. I always felt that he was trying to be candid, not like another cabinet minister in the government; I felt that he was as open and forthcoming as possible—until last Monday.

● (2220)

I was surprised and alarmed that he skirted around the questions and never answered them. What alarms me most is I do not think he knew the answers. I do not believe he was trying to be untruthful; he just did not know.

When I was elected in 1974, three Liberal members were elected in British Columbia, representing coastal fishing communities. Today there are none. It appears that at least the fishermen are trying to send this Liberal government a message that they are unhappy with the fishing policy as it is being administered. The government is not catching on to that message.

The minister is not going to British Columbia any more now than in the days when Liberal members represented those coastal fishing communities. If he cared for his entire portfolio, not only the eastern maritime portion but also the Pacific portion, he would go there a few times each year and hear first hand what the fishermen have to tell him.

I had several simple questions to put to the minister. First, will those fishermen who have herring fishing licences automatically be able to fish for herring roe? Second, in the event there is the exception of those people who already hold that licence, will there be other categories, such as natives and other groups, who will be subjected to the lottery system? Third, why did the minister shelve the program which the department had in place for the 1980 season? Since there had been a strike during that year and the program had never been used, why did they shelve that program for 1981 and surprise the fishing community with an entirely new, untried policy? The fishermen had already invested money in preparing themselves and their equipment for the policy announced in 1980.