

### Supply

control of Dome very much in Canadian hands. Obviously to satisfy the creditors it would have to provide a better offer than Amoco has been able to provide. That offer was laughed out of court not just by the creditors here in Canada but by Citibank in the U.S.

First we have this bizarre lack of knowledge by the Minister, then an incredible lack of consistency. How many days did we have to sit here in the House and listen to him saying, "No, this is a private sector decision and is not something the Government can get involved in"? How many days? How many weeks? Yet what did he do? He sat down with Amoco. He was not the only cabinet Minister to do that. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) did so. I am sure there were others. As a consequence, suddenly the "No, we cannot possibly get involved", became "yes, we should try to make our influence felt". As a result, the Minister claims credit this morning for Amoco agreeing out of the goodness of its heart to offer some shares to Canadians. A majority of shares? Even 43 per cent? Any kind of specific figure? No, nothing. Not a single detail. Yet we could be sure of ourselves in the future because Amoco was going to offer some of its shares, 5 per cent, 2 per cent, to Canadians. An act of total inconsistency.

When you are faced with a lack of knowledge and lack of consistency, what you do is attack. You attack a 1979 resolution by the NDP passed at the height of the world energy shortage, a resolution which talked about reducing or phasing out the kinds of gas exports—

**Mr. Shields:** Let's hear it now.

**Mr. Langdon:** —that had taken place in the past. As if that had anything to do with the policies of the NDP in 1987.

**Mr. Shields:** It has everything to do with it.

**Mr. Langdon:** It is exactly the same as if the former Prime Minister, now the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), stood up today and made a speech extolling the virtues of the agreement he made with the Premier of Alberta or had hoped to make with the Premier of Alberta concerning sharing gas revenues in 1979. That agreement led to not only the Premier of Alberta but a good many other Canadians rejecting that Prime Minister. Of course, as a consequence, the policies of the Conservative Party have vastly changed since 1979.

• (1620)

What do we have aside from this sorry record on Dome? It is bad enough; I mean it is bad enough to make any Parliament look in derision at a Minister of Energy who tries to defend himself with that kind of nonsense. In addition, we have the ruling by FERC, order No. 256. What it means is much more serious damage to the Alberta economy than has yet been done by the Conservative Government.

Perhaps it would be useful to quote, not from *The Toronto Sun*, but from *The Financial Post* which has a little more

knowledge in respect of energy issues. This article is from January, 1987. This issue did not suddenly rear its head last week. It has been around for some time. I have clippings of the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) talking about it over a year ago. It is an issue with which the Government has failed to deal. *The Financial Post* indicated:

As with lumber, where the U.S. said because Canada doesn't charge stumpage the way it does we have to change, so with gas; calculate demand charges the way U.S. says and then Canadian gas will be less competitive in the American market.

*The Financial Post* went on to say:

The gall of this stance is breath-taking. It was because of American bleatings that we deregulated gas pricing three years ago and let the market prevail. On this new basis, Canadian producers have signed contracts with American users. The sanctity of contracts freely entered into—an essential element of the enterprise system so staunchly upheld by most Americans—seems to mean nothing to FERC and its U.S. applicants.

What has happened is that 33 cents out of every 50 cents of demand charges which could previously be placed, not because Canadian companies established it as law but because American companies had signed contracts, must be dropped or these exports will not be possible in the future.

What are we heading toward? Frankly I think we are heading toward a situation where we have a Government in place which has proved itself to be incompetent on virtually every trade issue which has faced it.

We could talk about softwood. I quoted figures in Question Period earlier today which showed the Canadian market share. It is the market share which matters. The market share has declined by almost 3 per centage points from the same time last year.

We could talk about fish and the position into which Canadian producers on the East Coast were put where they have had to pay countervail on fish.

We could talk about shakes and shingles where we had the case of retaliation brought in by the Canadian Government, which proved to be not just totally ineffective in doing anything about the shakes and shingles levies but totally destructive in respect of the Canadian publishing industry.

We could talk about hogs and the case of Canadian farmers across the country who are still faced with levies which they must pay on hogs. If the levies do not work, U.S. states put into effect so-called health restrictions which stop hogs from crossing the border. Those health restrictions will be there just as FERC will be there regardless of whether or not there is free trade.

We could talk about grain and the fact that the United States has as a result of its Farm Bill put policies into effect which devastated farm communities in my county and in the counties of hundreds of other Members.

We cannot find a single place in which the trade policy of the Government has worked. There is not a single, solitary example of the Government's trade policy working for Canadians.