

Petroleum Incentives Program Act

generous? They provide 93 cents on every dollar, \$6.5 billion to an industry that is one of the richest in Canada. I wish the public could understand. I do not think they do. What will Liberal Canadianization mean? It will mean we will replace the Rockefellers with the Blacks and the Blairs, buddies of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Blais: The Blacks?

Mr. Waddell: Just look around. Look where they give their campaign contributions. Look at their friends and associates. Look at the connections. Look at who is supporting the National Energy Program in Alberta.

You, Mr. Speaker, and I as westerners know what the National Energy Program was. It was a move to get around Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia and go up north to explore. That is where the federal government is the colonial power. It is not necessary to deal with premiers Lougheed, Bennett and Blakeney. The federal government can call the shots. That is ludicrous. We should be drilling for oil in Alberta and developing the Lloydminster area, enhancing the heavy-oil recovery there. We should be giving money to Saskatchewan for an upgrader for its heavy oil. That is the kind of program we would have if we had a sensible energy policy. I warn members opposite that they are dealing with a six-foot Napoleon. That is what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is. I watched him walk out of the chamber tonight after the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) spoke. He was arrogant.

If members opposite are interested in energy, they should look at what is going on. In many ways, the oil industry is throwing everything on the government. What can we expect from the oil industry. Big oil companies have always had their own way. They have manipulated the National Energy Board and the federal government for years.

I reiterate, I do not question the thrust of the National Energy Program. I do not question the thrust of trying to get Canadian control of the industry. As the minister said, it is a strategic industry, and Canadians support that, but why do it this way? Why do it with a bureaucratic scheme that is convoluted and unworkable? It is our oil. I quote from page 17 of the National Energy Program:

—in general, price and tax policies have provided the industry with the cash flow necessary to finance its expenditures. This means that the oil consumer and the Canadian taxpayer have financed virtually all of the substantial expansion of this industry.

I am not an expert in this industry. I have tried to understand the problems of the oil industry. I do not think they are that difficult. For years the industry financed all of its expansion from its cash flow, unlike other Canadian companies, such as those in manufacturing, which had to borrow money from the banks.

● (2030)

The oil companies, because of the PGRT and the taxes, have had to go to the banks, and because of the downturn, the recession, they are experiencing some difficulty. But that is not reason enough for the government to cave in on everything, on

the good part of the National Energy Program. What the government should do is get back to Canadianization of Petro-Canada. Within the last year, as a result of the NEP inspired take-over, we spent \$6.5 billion, and we have increased Canadian ownership of oil and gas by 6 per cent. The minister said that in the House, and he was proud of it. I figure it was between 30 and 35 per cent.

This country, with its new Constitution, this proud and vibrant, healthy young country, now has an industry that is only 65 per cent to 70 per cent controlled by foreigners. The decisions in the Hibernia case are not going to be made in St. John's or Ottawa, they are going to be made in the boardrooms of Mobil in New York. The decisions on the tar sands are going to be made in the boardrooms of Shell. That is what we are facing.

I think I have clearly set out what alternatives there are, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to conclude by returning to the question: Energy and security, for whom? These bills are all part of a large package bill which was originally called the energy security bill. The Liberal answer seems to be energy security for the oil companies, companies like Dome and Nova. They have been drilling in Ottawa, and they have done very well. Government money is going to pay all the money. What do we get for the taxpayers and the consumers? We continually get holes. I very much think the government is going to face a major rebellion of these taxpayers and consumers when they understand just exactly what the government is going to do with their \$6.5 billion.

It is no wonder Canadians are becoming cynical, Mr. Speaker, about this energy policy. It is not what was promised. The Canadian public wants Petro-Canada to be the major player. I think the Canadian public would want this \$6.5 billion to go to Petro-Canada for expansion, instead of going to these oil companies. I think the Canadian public wants to expand conservation alternatives, and I think the Canadian public is way ahead of the government, and the opposition. I suggest to the government that it is really missing a great chance and a great opportunity for a real vision of Canada.

I know a little bit about your own background, Mr. Speaker, and I shall close with a biblical quote. You will appreciate that. I cannot remember what part of the bible it comes from, but I am sure you will know. It goes like this: "Your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions; and where there are no visions, the people perish."

What a vision, what a chance we had with the energy program, to make Petro-Canada the predominant, the major player; to get it into the driver's seat. Instead, we have chosen to continue the old program of giving money away to oil companies. I very much regret that. That is why we will be voting against this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): The member from Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) mentioned that this bill was bureaucratic, that it was unworkable, and that it entailed