

Supply

many of the benefits, and Alberta could gain many of the jobs and spin-offs which would exist and which are not at the present time being obtained.

Mr. Shields: Madam Speaker, I think everyone who listened carefully to the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor realizes that the NDP has a convenient policy which it enunciates because it can be a different policy in Saskatchewan, in Alberta and in British Columbia, the gas-producing parts of the country, from the one it enunciates here.

The Member also states, and I think it is utter rubbish, that the NDP would move to enhance or increase the consumption of natural gas in Canada and then maybe export gas. We are doing that. The Member knows full well about the National Energy Board's rulings and the reserves that have to be in place. We have a formula and we have been following it.

I think people will read through the NDP socialist garbage and claptrap that comes consistently, which I call NDP or socialist misspeak. What about his idea of a consortium to buy Dome led by Petro-Canada—and that is key because the socialists believe in state ownership of all enterprises in Canada whether the production of shoes or the production of oil and natural gas? What we are talking about is a bail-out of a company which is virtually insolvent or is considered to be insolvent or bankrupt. The Government has to bail out a company that has the problem it has today because of the National Energy Program perpetrated on Canada by the previous Government and, I might add, supported by the New Democratic Party, the socialists. The New Democrats may say that they voted against the NEP, but we all know that the Energy critic, the Hon. Member for Vancouver Kingsway, rose in this House and said "We shouldn't be going after PetroFina with Petro-Canada, we should nationalize one of the big boys, Esso". I think those were virtually his words. He will correct me if I am wrong.

I would ask the Member to elaborate on that because the Minister has been very clear in this House. He has been very clear in any speeches he has made and in every statement, that it was a private sector problem brought on by the National Energy Program which got Dome into trouble. It was a private sector solution, until the Minister of Energy who recognized the problems we were facing with Dome addressed them, as the previous Government would not, and then all of a sudden Dome received offers for amalgamation from TransCanada PipeLines and from Amoco. They were told ahead of time to make the best offer because the board of directors would make the decision. The federal Government does not own Dome and is not selling Dome. The Dome shareholders, who hold the Dome board of directors responsible, are selling Dome.

The Member asks how many shares of Amoco are going to be made available to the Canadian public. I think the Member honestly said that. He said, how much? Two per cent or 3 per cent? If the Hon. Member is as knowledgeable as he professes to be, he should know that the President of Amoco Canada, Don Stacy, said the following:

What we (Amoco) are committed to do is not have a net decrease in Canadian ownership (in the oil and gas industry), and in fact have a net increase in Canadian ownership as we develop this program over time with Investment Canada and as time allows us to issue shares.

● (1640)

That is the principle involved. There will be no decrease in Canadian ownership on the share issues, and that should be very clear. Why does the Hon. Member not acknowledge that that is what has been said and that that is the commitment that has been made?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The time for questions and comments has actually expired, but I will allow the Hon. Member two minutes to answer his colleague.

Mr. Shields: One minute of claptrap.

Mr. Langdon: Madam Speaker, there is so much claptrap, as the Hon. Member calls it, in that question that it is difficult to reply quickly. Let me say three things.

First, as the Hon. Member has been told many times, the New Democratic Party did not support the NEP, and especially not its details.

Mr. Shields: I was here, you weren't.

Mr. Langdon: Yes, but I read the votes and you obviously don't.

Second, the Hon. Member suggested that the NDP program would have everything owned by Government. I assume he has been reading our resolutions books very carefully from the reference he made of them in the debate. Clearly he is telling the House something which is quite false and quite unreflected in those resolutions. We have a commitment to using the state creatively, something which we believe this Government does not do. That is why I suggested that if necessary, Petro-Canada might be the leader of such a consortium.

Finally, with respect to the inconsistency of the Minister, I heard the Minister say for weeks in the House that this is a private sector issue and he would not interfere. Then he interfered. He interfered not to help Canadian companies take over Dome, not to open up the bids for Dome so that more would be provided, but to make certain that an American company would be able to take over this company with greater ease. That is the interference he undertook.

Mr. Bob Porter (Medicine Hat): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate this afternoon although I am not particularly pleased about the subject matter we are debating. As an Albertan and a small producer in the energy sector, I have listened to this rhetoric with the knowledge that order 256 is certainly causing concern to producers in western Canada. I can say that there are Albertan producers who will probably never get over what happened under the National Energy Program.