

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

unquestioned, to begin now to question that belief. What is it that pushed ill-conceived ideas of domestic boycotts and threats of retaliation to the surface? These are ideas that would have been considered ludicrous a few short months ago.

Sir, what has caused this, in large measure, is an energy policy put forward by a government that is insensitive to the mood and needs of Canadians just as it is insensitive to the international oil situation.

About a year ago both consuming and producing provinces had an energy package to which they could agree, an agreement which would have accelerated tar sands development and which would have brought resources to the east coast.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, oh!

**Miss MacDonald:** The hon. member from New Brunswick laughed, but this agreement would have helped out his part of the province.

This development would have brought resources to the east coast and would have protected those least able to afford it against price increases that even this government recognizes are inevitable. Those are the things that that energy agreement would have done. Instead of that, today we have dissention, we have dismay, we have distrust. We have no agreement and we have no protection for our consumers on fixed and limited incomes. From the reaction to this energy program and to this bill, we have no chance of reaching oil self-sufficiency before the end of this century.

The greater participation of Canadians in the oil and gas industry is something we all desire. It was very much a part of the former government's energy proposals. That participation would have been achieved by methods markedly different from the proposal set out in this bill but the goal would have been the same. The major difference is that this bill, rather than being part of an energy program which reflected a consensus, is a component of an over-all program which threatens both Canadian unity and Canadian self-sufficiency. That is the difference between the program that would have been in place under the former government and the one which this government is trying to force on the country.

The government's energy proposals have already stalled critical oil sands development and Bill C-48 will not restart them. The government's energy proposals have already driven drilling rigs and oil companies to cut back on their operations; indeed, to leave the country. Bill C-48 will not bring them back. They have already caused a serious setback to our exploration and our development potential. Bill C-48 will not make up for that loss.

If anyone has doubts about whether the statements I have made are correct, they need only look at the headlines in the newspapers day after day. On January 6, the headline in the *Ottawa Citizen* was, "Energy Policy Job Toll 40,000 say Oil Drillers". In *The Globe and Mail* on January 7, the headline was "New Federal Tax May Shut Oil Field in Saskatchewan". These are the things that the energy proposals are doing.

The tragedy is, Mr. Speaker, that none of this need have happened if the Liberal government had been willing to make a greater effort to produce an energy policy that did not deliberately set out to alienate the provinces and the industry, which are two necessary partners for a national energy program.

Today we could be debating a bill that really would offer Canada a larger stake in its oil industry as well as a secure energy future. But instead, we are debating a bill the goals of which have been undermined by the Liberal government.

We are debating a bill, the potential of which is sadly diminished by the context in which it is placed. We are debating a bill, of which the chances of success in achieving Canadianization and self-sufficiency are next to impossible, given the damage that the Liberal government has already inflicted on Canada's energy industry. And this damage is done at a time when both these goals of Canadianization and self-sufficiency are of critical importance. Canadianization, because we must be assured that the Canadian people, not the government corporations, not the multinational companies, but the Canadian people, have a say in how their resources are developed.

Self-sufficiency, because of the very precarious state of oil supplies internationally which could make any dependent country—even a country like Canada—hostage to external pressures.

We certainly do not want Canada to become any greater a hostage to international oil suppliers than it already is, but that is what we are well on the road to becoming, unfortunately. The proof, all too sadly, is readily apparent.

With tar sands developments stalled, with oil rigs drifting away, with money available for energy investment leaving the country, Canada's production of oil and natural gas is declining, not increasing.

● (2050)

With that decline in domestic production, we become increasingly dependent on unstable, expensive, unreliable supplies of foreign oil with all of the international pressures which that entails. When I spoke in this House on this subject last July, and again in December, I accused the Liberal government of allowing us to drift into greater dependency on offshore oil.

**An hon. Member:** You were wrong.

**Miss MacDonald:** Yes, I was wrong. Indeed I was wrong. Then I thought they were allowing us to drift into greater dependency on offshore oil. Now I know they are directing us into greater dependency on offshore oil through this so-called National Energy Program.

The motion which we were debating in the House last July warned against the Liberal government's indifference to the consequence of the global oil crisis and it condemned the government's failure to provide an energy program that would