When this policy was announced, certain provincial premiers complained. The Province of Alberta claims that it is a raid on Alberta's resources by central Canada; that it is a raid on those resources mainly by the population of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

I sat in the House of Commons at a time when there was great discussion of the oil industry, when a certain famous Canadian, Carl Nickle, was a member of the house. His speeches then were in favour of the oil industry, oil development, as his speeches are now. I have read his comments from time to time over the years.

I heard neither Carl Nickle nor Premier Lougheed complaining in the period when consumers of oil and gas from the Ottawa Valley line west were paying extra money for Alberta oil. There were no complaints then. The Alberta oil industry and the Province of Alberta, and the people in that region of Canada, gained \$2 billion during that period as a result of additional charges on the consumers in that part of Canada from the Ottawa Valley west. I do not think it is unjust to reverse the whole process. The revenues from resources in Alberta and Saskatchewan should not be totally, or even 90 per cent, blocked from the federal government. I think the people of Canada have a right to a larger share in the revenues from those sources.

I am certainly in favour of the Canadianization of the resource sector. I am not an oil expert, but as I read the policy, I think Canadianization has a great opportunity. Petro-Canada will be taking a 25 per cent interest in the Canada Lands. I am amazed to see from a map of the Canada Lands that the acreage in the ownership of the people of Canada through their federal government is almost twice as great as the acreage of the 10 provinces combined. That is a tremendous area of the country, and Petro-Canada will take a 25 per cent interest in developments in that large part of the country.

There are provisions to encourage Canadians to invest in their own industry. There are incentive grants placed in the budget and the National Energy Program to encourage Canadians to invest in their own industry.

The multinationals claim that they put in the risk capital and that this was necessary for the country. Yet, I am informed by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources that the depletion allowances, the tax concessions, often were 100 per cent or greater than the total cost of exploration. In other words, the public of this country has been paying the exploration costs, with the discovered oil resources becoming the property, in the main, of the multinational corporations. Well, surely that is not the wisest policy for any country to follow.

The incentive contained in the National Energy Program provides for the return of 80 per cent of the investment by Canadians by way of incentive grants. To be able to have a \$1 investment for 20 cents is not too bad. It is better than the proportion under the Western Grains Stabilization Act; it is better than crop insurance. It is two-to-one under the Crop Insurance Program, and three-to-one under the Western

Grains Stabilization Program. This particular arrangement provides for a four-to-one ratio.

Then there is an additional sweetener in the form of a further deduction that can be taken on the corporation's income tax return, namely, a further concession of 13 cents on the dollar. So, for every dollar that a Canadian invests in the Canada Lands through a Canadian company, the cost will be 7 cents. I can see a lot of Canadians wanting to invest in the Canada Lands on that basis. As well, the provinces are going to make it easy for Canadians to invest in provincial lands through Canadian companies.

I think this policy has a great deal of support. The Prime Minister made a speech in the City of Regina before 2,000 people, and supporting that meeting and in attendance in substantial numbers—and, incidentally, they paid \$25 a plate, so it was not something that was free—were such organizations as the Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association; the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Palliser Wheat Growers Association, the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association, and the Regina Chamber of Commerce.

That is not to say that they agree with the policy, but it does mean that they were prepared to attend that meeting and hear the Prime Minister of Canada, and I think that that was a wise thing for them to do. I would be just as happy if the Premier of Alberta were to experience the same kind of thing on a visit to Saskatchewan. I do not think there is anything wrong with that. I think it should be done, and I am pleased that these organizations were prepared to attend that meeting and listen to the Prime Minister, give him a hearing, and weigh what he had to say.

Sure the media twisted what was said. Individuals who were there that night—and they were very influential people—say, "The Prime Minister did not say that; that that wasn't the way he said it." You can clear a lot of air when you have the leader of the country go out and talk to representatives and leaders of responsible groups, such as were present that night. But, you know, the media watches the Prime Minister; they really do.

Senator Choquette: They made him.

Senator Argue: They do not say very much good about him. I do not think they really give him a fair shake. But people in public life get used to that. He went out there. He wanted to have his speech televised. Well, he didn't simply decide to take the money out of the public treasury to buy television time in Saskatchewan. To put this speech over the private television network in Saskatchewan, it was necessary—and I do not complain—that the Liberal Party produce the funds necessary to buy that television time, and that was done. But it is strange to me that when Premier Lougheed of Alberta was making a speech on the same subject, he went on provincial television in the Province of Alberta, paid for by the taxpayers of Alberta.

An Hon. Senator: Shame!