

Borrowing Authority Act

says. In paragraph (2) the minister is authorized to borrow money by the issue and sale or pledge of securities of Canada. That means the government is asking us to sign a blank cheque without knowing the type of securities they are going to give. Are they going to mortgage my home? Are they going to mortgage your home? Are they going to put our national parks up for sale? Are they going to sell our national resources? I would like to know that. They go on with "in such form, for such separate sums, as at such rates of interest" as they deem fit. I want to know what rate of interest they are going to pay. Are they going to pay 25 per cent, 50 per cent? Are they prepared to borrow at that rate? As an ordinary member of Parliament responsible for the purse strings, I should know that.

Here's a kicker. They can enter into any other terms and conditions as the governor in council, that is the cabinet, may approve. I simply cannot give anyone, with my responsibility to my constituents, a blank cheque like that.

I subscribe totally to the views expressed by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). Members opposite should listen very carefully to that member because he did more for Canada as a country than their government has so far in total.

Members opposite might wonder why three Albertans rise this evening. It has to do with our unique history. Albertans learned through the depression what it means to have no money and no access to money from central Canada. We had to bleed. We cut and we bled. We know of what we are speaking.

I am convinced that the huge annual deficit of \$14 billion, and the grotesque accumulated deficit of over \$74 billion, are distorting all aspects of our Canadian life. Many people wonder how large a billion dollars is. To me, it is a thousand millionaires. When you look at the spending of our government at the national level, you find that we strip a thousand millionaires to their shorts every week with our budget. We strip a thousand millionaires to their shorts every month just for the deficit.

The annual deficit for 1980 will take the equivalent of every cent from 14,000 millionaires in this country. That is just the deficit. It does not pay for the ongoing budget of \$60 billion. Members opposite, certainly the cabinet, would be wise to speak to Senator Manning of the other place if they want to find out how deeply we feel about balanced budgets in Alberta. They can speak to their own Senator Olson. He knows the western tradition. He will tell them what we learned about paying for things as you go. It means that future generations can have stability and a freedom to make decisions they might want to make in their time.

One might wonder why this deficit causes such distortion in our Canadian way of life. The first distortion is that the government has an unfair advantage over ordinary citizens and small businesses in particular when it comes to the marketplace. The reason is the government brings in bills like the one I just referred to whereby it can negotiate a loan at any rate, term or condition, and put up security that I as a businessman

cannot and therefore have no chance of meeting that type of competition.

The other distortion that is absolutely major in this country is the distortion over energy. What we need in this country and should have by 1990 is about ten tar sands projects on stream. The cost of that would be something like \$80 billion to \$100 billion. We do not have that money. I want to explain why.

With regard to the oil situation, we have three sources. We have the light conventional crude that is left in Alberta, which is relatively easy and cheap to produce. We are producing about 1.2 million barrels per day and have about ten years' supply left. We have synthetic which again comes largely from Alberta. There is an unlimited amount of that in terms of reserves. However, production costs places this at the going world price at this point. Then we have the third supply, imported oil. We import about 450,000 barrels a day at the world price. Of one thing we can be absolutely certain. Within ten years Canadians will be paying the world price. When the light conventional crude from Alberta is gone, we pay the world price. We might be importing every barrel from another nation or we might be producing it from the tar sands, but we will be paying the world price.

This is where the tragedy occurs. We need to have the money from that 10 billion barrels of light conventional crude in order to fund the synthetic oils. With our accumulated deficit, we do not have \$100 billion to put in the tar sands plants, so we need that money. To this point Alberta has already forgone about \$17 billion. Where has that money gone? Has it gone into tar sands plants? Absolutely not.

Has the money gone into making central Canadian manufacturing plants more competitive? Do we meet world competition with that subsidy? The fact is we do not. Even if we did, we could say it was justified because central Canada could compete in the world, but it does not. We still need to have tariff protection for central Canada. That tariff protection impacts directly on us in the west because it means we have to pay more for all the products we get. That is the tragedy.

We in the west also have a belief that we own those resources. That belief might seem strange to members opposite, but they just need to read the constitution of the nation. I will read parts of section 109:

All lands, mines, minerals, and royalties belonging to the several provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick at the Union, . . . shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick in which the same are situate or arise—

In 1930, by an amendment to the British North America Act, 21 George V, chapter 26 Statutes of the United Kingdom, the same rights were extended to Alberta and Saskatchewan. We feel we own those resources just as Ontario and Quebec own theirs.

Another distortion that we face is the interest that we in this country pay on the national debt. As a result of the \$74 billion we face the prospect this year of paying 25 cents or 25 per cent of every dollar in taxes in order to cover the interest on the debt. It will not reduce the principal by one cent. If we want to reduce the principal, we should probably be applying 50 cents