

tax and in addition he will tax everybody else. That is all it is. I think this should be said clearly. They are taxing the exports of natural gas, they are taxing domestic consumption of natural gas and all forms of natural gas.

I understand I need to move the subamendment in order to gain some extra time. I should like to move a subamendment to the amendment of the hon. member for St. John's West. I do not think any cannons will go off if I move it. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

and this House condemns the government for continuing the Liberal-Conservative policies that have brought Canada to its most serious recession since 1954, in particular for its policies of high interest rates, indifference to the poor, punitive taxes, and inflated prices; and this House further condemns the government for its failure to introduce in this budget a program of capital investment, a fair prices commission, cost of living tax credits and a serious commitment to public ownership in the oil industry to ensure that Canadians would no longer be industrial tenants in their own land.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rae: I will leave the question of energy as the key example of the government not doing things it claims to be doing. I do not want to spend a great deal of time on this because of the limitations of time and because the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) will be dealing with this question, but I want to make clear to the minister the nature of our objection. I am glad the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) is here. In the question period today I mentioned the cost to the Canadian economy of this phony goal of 50 per cent Canadian ownership. We are trading David Rockefeller for Conrad Black. So what? What is the importance of this?

Mr. Blaikie: Big deal.

Mr. Rae: Big deal, as the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) said. The key point is that the outflow of dividends will continue to be as big a problem in 1990 as it is now. It will be even bigger, because the amounts we are talking about will be so much bigger than they are at the moment. It means that the multinationals will be allowed to increase their market share. It means a few wealthy Canadians will benefit from this phony nationalism and that there will be continued foreign domination and outflow of dividends. The goal of 50 per cent ownership is meaningless unless one talks about control. It is a meaningless figure, it is a meaningless idea. It is so meaningless that it was stated by the Prime Minister in 1974 as one of his key objectives of the next six years. In the national energy policy released last night the minister said, "We do not know how we will get there, we have no method of enforcing it, but it continues to be a very important objective of the government."

The hard fact of the matter is that we are charging \$16.75 for a barrel of oil right now. Imperial Oil, the largest oil company in Canada, has total assets worth \$4.6 billion and an annual revenue of \$6.6 billion. The province of Manitoba has revenues of \$1.7 billion. That is the size and kind of institution

about which we are talking when we are charging \$16.75 for a barrel of oil. Imagine what revenues will flow and what the assets side of Imperial Oil will be by 1990. Imagine how big, how mammoth it will be, all of it subsidized by the phony policy of this government.

It is just amazing the press is able to say that it represents a tremendous advance to Canadianization and that we in the NDP must be really worried because the Liberals are moving in on our ground. We were shaking in our boots last night as the minister read his statement. We felt that the two ministers combined had come up with a real radical document. Imperial Oil will only own all of Canada by 1990, and we can take satisfaction from the fact that 50 per cent of it will be owned by the wealthiest people in Canada! That gives us a lot of worry.

Mr. Rose: It is a fake to the left.

Mr. Rae: As the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose) has so aptly described it, it is the biggest fake to the left since the last fake to the left of the Liberal party.

Finally, this is a profoundly damaging budget because it continues to apply the same unsuccessful phony remedies as have been applied by Liberal and Conservative governments to our basic economic problems for too long. It is damaging in another sense, because it is an admission of defeat. It is a declaration of intellectual bankruptcy because it does by stealth what the Tories tried to do openly, but it does exactly the same thing and has exactly the same effect.

I should like to refer to just two matters because I know my colleagues will be referring to others.

● (1730)

The projections that are contained in this budget for the social services provided to the people of Canada by the Government of Canada indicate that those basic services will be under the most severe attack since they were established. There is no getting around that fact. There is no getting around the fact, for example, that the rate of growth in this so-called envelope will be 10.6 per cent in 1981, 6.3 per cent in 1982 and 6.9 per cent in 1983. I see that the minister would like to argue that this matter should be taken care of by the provinces. Will eight Tory provincial governments provide social services to the people of Canada? That is a statement coming from a government which is supposed to care about the provision of services for the people.

I say to the minister quite honestly, and I know his role personally in the introduction of medicare, that if this was the attitude of the Pearson government in the 1960s, we would never have had medical care for all Canadians; never. It is a guarantee that we will never take on the new challenge of providing daycare so that women can have a genuine choice between whether they want to stay at home and whether they want to go to work. We will never have a national co-ordinated system which guarantees that women in Newfoundland have the same rights in this vital field as the people of Manitoba or Saskatchewan. It is a guarantee that the over-all level of social