

Petro-Canada Act

Liberal government, however, has in the most complicated and convoluted way possible chosen the worst of all possible worlds. Instead of using Petro-Canada, the Liberals have opted for an expensive and unworkable program of grant giveaways to their chosen friends in the private sector. This is Liberal Canadianization. It is phony and it is a sham. Consumers pay at the pump. The money comes out of the pockets of consumers. The government takes \$6.5 billion of it and gives it away over five years in the form of grants to private Canadian oil companies whose express interest is to export the oil and gas once found. I will illustrate this point a little later in my speech.

Therefore, the question is: Energy security for whom, Mr. Speaker? It is not for the consumer or the taxpayer. They are getting hosed. We will propose during the course of this debate a simpler and more effective way based on predominant public ownership. We would use the \$6.5 billion grant money to take over one of the large multinationals through Petro-Canada. We would take the remainder of the money, because there would be some left, and we would put it where it should go, that is, into real energy security. In other words, into energy conservation and alternates. I will come back to that in a moment. Also I want to make reference to the minister's speech.

The energy pattern in this country is to give grants and tax concessions to private companies. There is an energy crisis and they need these things. Private companies have to find oil and gas. They find oil and gas and they want to export it. They export the resources and then they need more grants and tax concessions in order to continue. When are we going to break this pattern? We will not break it unless we make Petro-Canada the predominant company.

Before I go into some details of how Liberal Canadianization works vis-à-vis Petro-Canada, I have some remarks with respect to the speech made by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes). I see him here in the House. I am amazed when I hear Tory policy on Petro-Canada. I remember back to the much lamented Joe Clark government, lamented by them but by no one else, in which the Conservative Party had not one, not two, but three policies on Petro-Canada. The first policy was to privatize the whole thing, that Petro-Canada was bad. I was going to say it was a political position, but it was almost a theological position that Petro-Canada was bad, even though other countries in the world, such as Mexico, Norway and Britain, had set up government-owned oil companies.

Mr. Thacker: Would you like to move to any of them?

Mr. Waddell: If the hon. member would listen to his policies on Petro-Canada, not many people would move to a country that has these kinds of policies. The first policy was to privatize Petro-Canada.

Mr. Thacker: Answer the question.

Mr. Waddell: Then the second policy was to privatize part of PetroCan. The third policy, which came into view during

the course of the 1980 election campaign, was that they did not know what they were going to do with it. The present Tory policy is that they still do not know what they are going to do with Petro-Canada. The Tories nit-pick at the kinds of people who are running the company and so on. What are the Tories going to do? Are they for it or against it? Are they going to vote for or against this bill? It is not good enough to take 40 minutes to throw out suggestions, as the hon. member for Calgary West did. Did we ring the bells for that? Is that what the big fight was about? We expected to hear some real policy from the Conservatives. I can imagine how difficult it must be for the hon. member for Calgary West and the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) to drive up to a Petro-Canada gas station in Calgary in their Lada automobiles and get served by a bilingual attendant and their gas measured in metric.

Mr. Thacker: Would you answer the question?

Mr. Waddell: It was not little Bob Rae and the NDP who knocked out the Clark government. It was the people of Canada. They had had enough and that is why the people threw them out. It was because of their stupid policies on Petro-Canada, among other things. It is not good enough to say: "Well, they threw them out in eastern Canada". They did not. People threw them out in western Canada also. In most of my colleagues' ridings in western Canada, the Conservative vote went down and the New Democratic vote went up. The Tories were not popular, and Petro-Canada was one of the reasons for that unpopularity.

I thought the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), the Tory's previous energy critic, was starting to bring the Conservative party back from their allegiance to big oil. But with my friend, who is the new energy critic, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre), the Conservatives are back in the same old position of wanting to get rid of Petro-Canada and complete their free enterprise theology at all costs. What is the difference between a Tory and a dinosaur, Mr. Speaker? At least they bury dinosaurs.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Waddell: I see the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) laughing. He thinks he is going to get off lightly. Let me deal a little with this Liberal Canadianization policy. I want the minister to listen and I thank him for staying in the House to listen.

Mr. T. Trevor Eyton, President of Brascan Ltd. spoke recently to the Montreal Chamber of Commerce. He gave a rare and accurate insight into modern corporate thinking about government investment in the economy. I put it to the minister that he agrees with this thinking. Mr. Eyton said that governments should invest their vast pools of capital in the private sector but leave the decision-making to businessmen. Mr. Eyton also said:

My suggestion is that governments should invest in private enterprise as substantial minority partners with the objective being to provide the requisite financing.