

Canada Oil and Gas Act

In the years leading up to the introduction of the National Energy Program, we Canadianized the oil industry and we reduced foreign ownership from 90 per cent to 70 per cent by creating new business and new wealth in Canada, owned by Canadians. The Canadianization that has been taking place as the result of the national energy policy has been to buy up foreigners. Instead of using Canadian money to do what we were doing—and very successfully—in the decade prior to the national energy policy, by creating new energy resources in Canada owned by Canadians, we have driven out the foreign money; and so caused a problem with respect to interest rates for all of Canada; an exchange rates problem, a balance of payments problem, and we have caused trouble with our OECD partners in terms of trust in Canada as a place in which to invest. The NEP has not caused the creation of one drop of new oil. That is really the problem.

This national energy policy is not helping to build Canada. It is not helping to create opportunities for individual Canadians, whether it is to own their own home or have their own business or have a private stake in this land of opportunity. What we have done is to squash them down with an attitude that the state knows best, that Big Brother is superior and Big Brother has the right to take away part of what they create, without giving them compensation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on Bill C-48 for some time, both in the House and in committee, and have heard various groups and associations discuss the broad principles of the bill which will take us forward in the Canada lands. I am certain that all members of the House recognize the importance of the bill and the long-lasting effects it will have. As I listened to the debate on the motion before us, it seemed to me that many of us may have forgotten that our basic goals are the same. That discovery may take us by surprise but if we look at what we all want, we will find that it is the same thing—more Canadian control of the oil and gas industry, more efficient development of those resources, resulting in self-sufficiency by 1990, or maybe before or after. We want a healthy oil and gas industry with the benefits it will bring to the Canadian economy and we want to reduce inflation and to see more employment. All of these spin-offs can come from a vibrant oil and gas industry.

I do not think any of these objectives are controversial or any of those priorities different. Perhaps the basic problem is that our philosophies are fundamentally different. I do not think we should lose sight of two things of very grave importance in this legislation, the fact that our goals are compatible and could be more compatible if the government had accepted more of the amendments put forward by all sides.

In Bill C-48 the government has presented its blueprint for resource development in Canada lands. We in the Conservative Party are saying, "Wait a moment." With this motion we are saying there is another way of accomplishing Canadianization than that proposed in the bill. That is our philosophy, if

you will; we believe it will work better in the long run than the approach outlined in Bill C-48.

We believe that the private sector can do a better job of resource and development than the government can. In good faith, I ask members of all parties to consider that Motion No. 21 could accomplish, far more quickly than anything else in this bill, self-sufficiency and the resource development we need in northern Canada.

Let us step back from the specifics of the motion for a moment. I spoke about goals and said that our goals are compatible but that the means of achieving them were different. I asked members to consider how they set their own goals and their own priorities; how they go about reaching those goals.

I believe that when the individual is motivated from within himself to do something that will fulfil him personally, he is far more likely to drive for excellence than if he is told by someone else how to reach his goals, how he must act if he is to do it for someone else. When a person sets his own goals and develops his own strategy for attaining them, then he has all the motivation he needs to do a fine job. If someone else seeks to define his goals and tells him how to achieve them, he will soon find his initiative sapped, and his drive greatly reduced. I think that is one way to define personal fulfilment, that it is the end result of goal setting and goal achievement.

● (2020)

If one takes away an individual's ability to decide upon and to work toward his own goals, one robs him of that end fulfilment. By denying a person his drive, I believe that one encourages mediocrity. I always remember that when I was in school I hated to get involved in group projects. The reason was that no matter how hard one worked by oneself, when the project was completed, everyone received the same grade. It did not matter how much one was motivated or how hard one worked, when the end result came in, it was the same for everyone. I noticed this throughout my school years.

What happened as a result? Soon group projects were not done very well. The people in the lower grades who were initially motivated and who worked hard soon found that there was no benefit coming to them in participating in group projects, and as a result they slacked off. They stopped working as hard and soon lost that motivation which was so necessary to achieve good grades and a good education in school. I had often hoped that teachers would not organize group projects as often as they did, unless it was a type project that was fun rather than one that was meant to teach students, such as a math project.

If goal achievement is what spurs people on, it does not make any sense to say that society would be better off or better served by having government tell us how to attain our goals or how to reach achievement for this country. It saps initiative, promotes mediocrity, weakens drive, and eventually lowers us all to the same common low denominator. That is why I rejected the socialist philosophy at a very young age.