

one day become a country with one rich province imposing its whims on the other nine if Alberta uses its billions to take control of foreign companies and the federal government does not maintain its role of enforcing the sharing of wealth between rich and poor provinces.

The other nine provinces would eventually be at the mercy of Alberta's every fancy, he said, and a wave of (Alberta) nationalism of unprecedented strength could rise up if the federal government held back now from showing its teeth.

'We don't pay enough attention to this threat,' Lalonde said, 'But it's a real one, it's there.'

That is downright scary in terms of what it says about the mentality of the minister of the Crown. It indicates that a national minister of the federal government feels that the bigger threat to unity in Canada than Quebec separatism—René Levesque's party and what René Levesque stands for—is wealth in Alberta. It is almost mind-boggling to think that there is that kind of person sitting around the cabinet table, but it goes a long way to explain the real intention and purpose behind the national energy policy which has nothing to do with energy but has everything to do with preventing any increase in wealth in Alberta.

**Mr. Waddell:** Alberta's poor, eh?

**Mr. Andre:** It has everything to do with that. I hear some giggles—

**Mr. Waddell:** Oh, come on, Harvey. Alberta is not poor.

**Mr. Andre:**—from the Liberal rump here. He says Alberta is not poor. I question any New Democrat, Liberal or any other person who calls himself Canadian who says that it is better for Canada to continue to rely on Mexico—

**Mr. Waddell:** I didn't say that.

**Mr. Andre:**—on Venezuela and on the Middle East than to pay domestic oil prices, to pay other Canadians, western Canadians, for their oil and gas development. Yet that is the essence of the National Energy Program. That in fact is what has happened. The reality is that this minister of energy, as evidenced by his statement in a speech in Sherbrooke, Quebec, considers it far more dangerous for Canada that there be wealth in Alberta than that we be energy self-sufficient or that we continue to increase or maintain our reliance on Middle East and OPEC nations. It is truly tragic. I hope for the sake of the country that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will remove that person from his portfolio. He is doing incredible disservice and damage to Canada.

● (1640)

The parliamentary secretary talked about the energy pricing agreement and winners and losers. As indicated by Mr. Riedl of Bunting and Co. Limited, the real loser was the consumer. I have to chuckle at the frequency with which the government talks about this made-in-Canada oil pricing scheme, the implication being that the price of crude oil in Canada is independent of what happens in the rest of the world. The price is blended, Mr. Speaker. The domestic price and the imported price are blended together to get a price at the refinery and therefore at the pump. If the world price goes up,

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

the consumer pays more; it is as simple as that. To suggest that there is some separation because of this made-in-Canada thing is as accurate as the falsehood that we will be energy self-sufficient in 1990 as a result of this policy. That is total fabrication.

Canada lost money as a result of the year that elapsed between the announcement last year of the National Energy Program, when the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) was somehow tricked into reading the program of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and the pricing arrangement that was arrived at on September 2 this year. In that year \$10 billion left Canada. That \$10 billion left Canada never to come back. Had that \$10 billion stayed here and had it been invested in Canada, it could have generated untold jobs, economic prospects and so on. Instead, that money has been lost to Canada as a result of this one year's delay in achieving a pricing agreement.

What did the government get for its one year's delay? It did not get the crude oil pricing regime it wanted. In fact, one year later, on September 2, 1981, the federal government caved in and acquiesced to the same crude oil pricing arrangement that was offered to the government in July, 1980. The federal government got nothing in that regard. There was a complete loss, a tremendous cost to the country.

The parliamentary secretary said that people had falsely implied that somehow the National Energy Program was designed to direct activity away from provincial lands to Canada lands. He assured the House that was not the case and that the energy pricing arrangement showed that. But he neglected to mention that when the NEP was brought down originally it contained a provision to eliminate the depletion allowance provided for provincial lands but it was retained in the case of federal lands. If that is not a deliberate, barefaced prejudicial move against provincial lands as opposed to so-called Canada lands, I do not know what is. Finally, a year later, after the government realized it was unable to act unilaterally and that Canada is a federal country, the federal government was forced to reach an agreement with the provinces and that particular provision was dropped. It was not dropped voluntarily; the government was forced to drop it.

The real losers as a result of the NEP and of the stupidity last year are the ordinary Canadian citizens, especially those who have been renewing mortgages this year. It is ironic that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cosgrove) has sat here daily for the last few weeks taking abuse for the high interest rates that people are paying on their mortgages. It is unfair really because it is not his fault. It is the fault of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and his partner in crime, the Minister of Finance, who read out that absurd policy last year.

That is not an opinion held by me in isolation or by my party. It is the opinion of the Governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Bouey. He indicated that the National Energy Program is responsible in large measure for the higher interest rates in Canada vis-à-vis the United States. No less a voice than the Governor of the Bank of Canada said that. Therefore, Canadians who are feeling the pinch of high interest rates, who have