

I see your signal, Mr. Speaker, warning me I have to conclude. Unfortunately, I would have liked to answer the other questions asked by my colleague. But if there is time for other questions, I would be pleased to do so.

● (1620)

[English]

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, as a westerner and as one who suffered with many others through the devastating effects of the National Energy Program, I find it an unwarranted revision of history to suggest that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) donated or turned over to multinational oil companies something from the Treasury of Canada.

In actual fact, the record of the oil industry, be it multinational or domestic, is a reinvestment record of some 105 per cent. To have suggested to us by a dubious ornament of the rump, which governed Canada from 1980 to 1984 without a national mandate, that the Prime Minister of the current Government is doing anything less than restoring justice to western Canada is an insult to the people of that part of our country.

The estimate has been made by none other than the great former Premier of Alberta, Peter Lougheed, that something in the order of \$17 billion up to as much as \$40 billion of wealth was looted from Alberta by the National Energy Program. These funds could have gone to develop the diversity of the economy of that region, had it not been for the rapacious policies of the previous Government.

The Hon. Member said that the present Prime Minister acted immediately after the election. He did, because he delivered on a promise which had been made to the people of Canada that the National Energy Program would be obliterated. We wait with keen anticipation for the day when it will truly be totally obliterated with the total elimination of the PGRT.

I should like to give the Hon. Member an opportunity to correct the record. I am sure that he was, in his fine oratorical style, getting carried away with himself. There was certainly no gift to any multinational oil company by the Prime Minister of Canada or the present Government of Canada.

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I respect the fact that the Hon. Member wants to represent the interests of his province and of his region. He wants to ensure that the Canadian Government is passing legislation and implementing policies which will affect his region in a positive sense.

However, I should like to refer to his interpretation of a short four-year period in the history of Canada, when a national Government in Ottawa was trying to implement a national energy policy for the benefit of all Canadians. Obviously it was his own interpretation of history. Perhaps I have an opinion that is different from his opinion, but I want him to realize that Canada is probably one of the only

countries in the world with the unique position of establishing a national energy policy in consultation with other levels of Government.

**Mr. Edwards:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Ouellet:** In my view it was because of the unique character of our Government. If we look at any other country in the period of crisis throughout the seventies, we see that the shots were called in Washington in relation to energy policy. The shots were called in London in relation to energy policy. The shots were called in Paris in relation to energy policy. In every country of the world the shots were called in the national capital. Why were the shots not being called from Ottawa in relation to Canada?

The Hon. Member feels that what was done in the interests of Canadians was not right. However, I want to tell him that he should make a distinction between a Conservative Government of Alberta being hand in hand with the multinationals and the citizens of Alberta who over the years did not benefit greatly from the cozy deal of the petroleum multinationals and the Alberta Conservative Government.

**Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly have a difficult time agreeing with the last comments of the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet).

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton):** It is unanimous.

**Mr. Greenaway:** Yes, I think it is unanimous. It is absolute rubbish.

I think it would be interesting to take a brief look at what has happened in the shake and shingle industry both in Canada and in the United States since the invoking of a 35 per cent tariff on May 22. Several predictions were made at that time, one of which was that Canadian jobs would be lost. That certainly has happened. A second prediction was that the entire industry in Canada and the U.S. would be severely damaged. That is also happening.

For the record I should like to read several quotations from some United States newspapers which graphically indicate what is taking place in the United States. Here is an editorial from the *San Francisco Chronicle*, "The Voice of the West", dated May 28. It is entitled "A Case of Shingles", and reads:

The Reagan administration began talks on freeing trade between this country and Canada last Thursday. That evening, without notice to Canada, the administration announced a tough 35 per cent import tariff on Canadian cedar shakes and shingles, a duty which will effectively shut these products out of the U.S. market. Canadians will lose sales of between \$180 million and \$200 million annually.

Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has termed the action "bizarre". We agree. The decision to abandon a dedication to the principles of the free market place is unfortunate and difficult to accept. Up to now, the administration has been fairly consistent in resisting protectionist arguments.

Prime Minister Mulroney is an ideological supporter of President Reagan and has battled to increase and widen relations with the United States. The shake and shingle tariff is severely damaging to a man who is dedicated to building closer ties to this country.