

Canadian ownership. What guarantees do we have that privately owned Canadian oil companies will act much differently from foreign oil companies?

An hon. Member: None whatsoever.

Mr. Riis: Does anyone believe that a good part of the \$12 billion price rip-off of consumers by the multinationals, documented in the Bertrand report, would not have occurred if Husky, Dome, Norcin and Home Oil had replaced Imperial, Gulf, Texaco and Shell? Would Canadian corporate heads be acting and responding differently from American or Dutch corporation heads?

Privately owned oil companies, whether foreign or Canadian controlled, have as a goal the maximization of profits, to be achieved by one of a number of ways or combinations: higher prices, more exports, or more tax concessions. Canadian consumers and taxpayers lose under this scenario, as is so plainly evident.

While believing in some private ownership in this sector, the NDP wants majority public ownership and control. This is what we see as being true Canadianization. This is why we advocate making Petro-Canada a leader, by advocating a take-over of Imperial Oil, Canada's largest and most powerful oil company. The Liberal plan is to endorse and encourage private Canadian ownership at the taxpayers' expense, rather than public ownership to provide obvious taxpayers' benefits.

I want to emphasize one very critical point. Canadians, whether consumers or people involved in the oil and natural gas industry, are now concerned about exploration in the frontier lands of Canada and in the offshore opportunities. Under the National Energy Program, the taxpayers of Canada will fund a Canadian, privately-owned company to the maximum of 93 cents on every dollar spent on exploration on Canada lands. Ninety three cents out of every dollar will be supported by Canadian taxpayers, after tax, after a grand cost to the company of only seven cents on the dollar.

I suspect that a great number of industries in Canada would love to have the Canadian taxpayers paying 93 per cent of their development and exploration costs. I can certainly identify a number of small businesses in our country which would love to have that kind of government support. Of course, the companies which would be supported by the taxpayers are the same companies which take out full page ads in almost every major newspaper and publication in Canada, decrying the hard times they are facing and how much need there is for the Canadian taxpayer to be coming up front with 93 per cent of their exploration costs.

What kind of equity would the taxpayers get in return? Under Clause 27 of Bill C-48 they would only get a 25 per cent Crown share in federal lands. In this amendment, we say that the minimum public ownership on federal lands should be 50 per cent through the people's Crown agency, PetroCan.

Between 1977 and 1980, the federal Liberals gave income tax breaks to the foreign-controlled resource sector worth a total of over \$13 billion without getting any equity or owner-

ship in return. Over the same period, income tax collected from the petroleum industry was only \$5 billion. We in the NDP say that it is time the consumers and taxpayers of Canada, who have funded the growth and profits of this industry, get some ownership in return. If we are paying the piper, it is time we called the tune. We can do that only through majority public ownership and control.

Mr. John Thomson (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the sad thing about the legislation we have before us this afternoon is that the people who wrote it did not have the faintest idea what they were doing. It looks as though some recent graduate in economics has sat down and said, "Look, finding oil is not all that difficult. All one has to do is punch a hole in the ground and up jumps some oil or gas. That is not very difficult, and if these oil companies do not want to do it, the government will do it."

The National Energy Program which has come forth from the Liberal government is playing Russian roulette with the welfare of the people of Canada and their future. I know that hon. members on the opposite side of the House do not believe that. I think they do not believe it because they do not understand the oil and gas industry. I do not think they really understand what they are trying to accomplish in this legislation. What this legislation is trying to say is that if we can destroy foreign investment in this country, and if we can destroy the oil and gas industry in some way, that will lead us to energy self-sufficiency or, more particularly, to oil self-sufficiency. Surely the critical factor in this legislation and in the whole National Energy Program should be energy self-sufficiency, more particularly oil self-sufficiency.

● (1550)

There are two aspects I want to address this afternoon. One concerns our relationship with the rest of the world, our trading partners, the foreign investors on which Canada must rely for its industrial and economic growth and with our friends. The other aspect is oil self-sufficiency. I want to tell hon. members categorically that we do not have a chance in blazes of achieving oil self-sufficiency by 1990. I do not care what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) says, we will not achieve oil self-sufficiency by 1990. I will relate the reasons why that will not happen.

First, I want to try to put the question of oil self-sufficiency into perspective as simply as I can. Every day in Canada 1.8 million barrels of oil are consumed, of which we import 400,000 barrels a day. We have 1.4 million barrels of oil production within our country. Of that production, 200,000 barrels come from synthetic sources and 1.2 million barrels come from what we refer to as conventional oil production. We use 1.8 million barrels of oil per day. We produce 1.4 million barrels a day and 400,000 barrels of oil a day are purchased from OPEC.

In the 1981 report put out by the National Energy Board the consumption and demand supply relationship over the next ten years was looked at. The board reported that consumption will not increase very much over the next ten years. Therefore,