

encouraging drilling and giving up to 92 per cent in tax write-offs. As a result of the drilling and finding of gas, there has been pressure from companies which have a cash flow problem. They have to sell the gas. The government is overbuilding pipelines, hurrying through the pre-build of the Alaska pipeline, even at the risk of expropriating people's property with police state methods and archaic laws, as was pointed out in question period today by my colleague for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker). Then the policy comes out. It advocates that Canadians switch to natural gas. That does not give you much confidence in a gas policy dealing with exports and problems with exports.

The government overbuilds pipelines, continues to follow a strange policy. With regard to the pre-build, for example, the government said it had the support of the President of the United States. When we said he might not be there next year, they said no. They said they had the support of congress. When we said the congress might change, they said no. Now the government is in the difficulty and is never going to see the Alaska highway pipeline built. They rammed that bill through Parliament. I personally brought a lawsuit against the cabinet on this thing—

● (1620)

An hon. Member: How are you doing with it?

Mr. Waddell: The member asks me how I am doing. Very well. The case has been set for trial and I hope that we will be able to subpoena some senior government people. They can wait with bated breath.

Mr. Siddon: Is it before the courts?

Mr. Waddell: Yes, it is before the courts, which is why I am limited in what I can say about the case.

I might tell hon. members that the government is so together on it they even technically defaulted on their pleadings, that is, they forgot to appear. We could have obtained a default judgment against them, which would have stopped the pipeline. They finally got through to Ottawa and received some instructions. That case is continuing.

I want to quote from the energy paper at page 36:

Producers will not suffer any reduction in the price which they currently obtain for their exports or their domestic sales, except for a small loss due to the taxation of pipeline fuel. In setting the export price of natural gas in the future, the price will be adjusted to take into account this tax.

I say that the minister of energy was really misleading us with that statement. He knew, or should have known, that he could not increase the price of natural gas to the United States. He brought in a gas tax of 30 cents per 1,000 cubic feet which is to go into effect in February. On November 15, he announced that there would be no export tax on gas. What does that mean? In effect, it means that the money, the \$300 million from Alberta and \$50 million from British Columbia, will have to come out of the pockets of the people in British Columbia and Alberta, rather than being passed on to the Americans. This means that no sooner is the ink dry on the

Petroleum Administration Act

figures in this document, the national energy policy, the paper is cracking. Those figures are wrong. The minister said there would be \$3.6 billion gained by the province of British Columbia from gas revenues. That is wrong. It took a few weeks to see that it was wrong. Actually, it will be less than half that. This, in the eyes of the province, discredits this paper with respect to gas policy.

With respect to another more populist level, if I can call it that, in terms of gas conversions, what people are asking in my constituency is: can they convert their oil furnaces to gas furnaces. It holds out a promise, but it is an imperfect one. There is no protection to people from the CHIP insulation style rip-offs from contractors. The minister refuses—I talked to him about it yesterday—to finance the program through utility companies like B.C. Hydro and Quebec Hydro, which would enable low income people to receive subsidies over the years from hydro to pay for conversions. It does nothing to help senior citizens or to deal with their problems. Since it is a taxable grant received as a result of converting one's furnace to gas, will it come off their GAINS program or their old age pension program? There are always concerns which remain unanswered. In Quebec, the minister's own province, two-thirds of the people are tenants. This policy does nothing for them. It does not even approach the problem. Again, the Liberals walk the muddled ground. The reality of this energy program is far different from the illusions.

The real flaw in the program, and I will conclude with this, is that if you look at a worker in St. John's, in Toronto or Vancouver, you will see they are unified. They have something in common. They have economic concerns. Suddenly they find their heating cost will double next year—zap, their price of gasoline will double. They can cope with these increases if they have a secure job. That is what I mean when I say that the greatest flaw in this policy is the failure to give back to the people some cushion, some guarantee that they will have jobs to pay for the increase, when you are raising energy, oil and gas prices by so much. This is what people are concerned about.

The Arctic pilot project is a good example. Here are the great words of this policy and here is the reality in the Arctic pilot project, under which Petro-Canada and other companies will ship gas from Melville Island in the Arctic, in foreign built ships, manned by foreign crews, and then export it to the United States. That is what is happening in terms of policy. That is the reality, which is what the workers of this country are worried about. They do not see any industrial strategy which would provide jobs for their children and their children's children.

Mr. Speaker, an old Scot once told me that the only way capitalism works is when you have 12 men looking for the ten available jobs. It seems to me that when you really get down to this policy what the government is telling Canadians is that they do not have a right to own their own home, they do not have the right to a job, they do not have the right to a lifestyle to which they have become accustomed.

An hon. Member: That is socialism.