—in the case of a licence, other than a licence for the exportation of power, the Board is of the opinion that the public convenience and necessity so requires.

The government exempted electrical power. On the one hand that, frankly, is an example of a responsive government. It is an example of another success as a result of the bell-ringing incident. If we had not had separate bills and opportunities for these utilities to make their views known in the committees, we would not have this improvement, which certainly is an improvement for electrical utilities. However, on the other hand, it is offensive, because it does not exclude natural gas. For goodness' sake, why in blazes can this government not be as responsive to the concerns of western Canadian gas producers as it is to central Canadian electricity producers? That is not to criticize the government for being responsive to the power utilities. That is an example of good government, but if we are to keep this blooming country together, and if this government is to be a national government for the whole nation—all of it from Newfoundland to Vancouver Island—at some point in time it must start to be as concerned about the problems and concerns of natural gas producers in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan as it is about electricity producers in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick. We applaud the change but for goodness' sake why could the change not reflect the fact that this is the Government of Canada, all of Canada and not just central Canada or eastern Canada?

Clause 27 would allow the governor in council—again the minister and his minions—to set the prices for oil and gas exports. Again, how is the producer going to be able to negotiate an export sale of gas or oil when the governor in council can set the price? The United States has a deregulated oil and gas industry.

Mr. Lalonde: Not gas.

Mr. Andre: Not gas yet. I am sorry. The minister is right, but oil is certainly deregulated, and soon gas will be. That means there is a marketplace. The price a producer can get for what he has to sell is the market price.

Mr. Lewis: And it is getting lower.

Mr. Andre: Incidentally, it is coming down, while ours is going up.

Mr. Lalonde: Not gas.

Mr. Andre: We will see. We will see. There is a marketplace. The price at which a commodity can be sold is the market price, so why in blazes put into law that the governor in council or the cabinet—the minister and his minions—will set the price? They might as well put it into law that the governor in council has the right to order that there shall be no rain on weekends. That would be a nice law and we would all approve, but the government is not capable of doing that. It is not capable of doing this either, but it can frighten potential buyers and make it more difficult for potential sellers. Of course, that is what the government is doing.

Clause 29 is even better in terms of big brother gone mad. This clause would set up a whole new part to the National Energy Board Act which would give the National Energy Board the right to regulate all aspects of interprovincial oil and gas trade. Since 1980 and 1981 there have been various spokesmen for the government saying we have to change the Constitution of Canada so that we are at least a common market; if it is nothing else, Canada at least has to be a common market. No one argues about that. We should be a common market, but if we are a common market, then why in blazes do we have to have big brother regulating interprovincial trade in oil and gas through the National Energy Board? Is it trade when Saskatchewan Power buys gas from Alberta, or is that just persons in the same common market doing business with each other in the normal way? Is big brother going to treat Canada as some sort of collection of ten independent states which are to be regulated by the National Energy Board? Why is that in there? Why in blazes do we do that? The government will never admit it, but I think it has to do with federal-provincial conflicts. Big brother—the federal government—would like to have the legal authority to say to any province: "By cracky, if you want to sell your gas or your oil or if you want to buy some gas or oil, you are going to have to come through us." The federal government wants to control that. It wants to be in control of all aspects of interprovincial trade. That is offensive to my definition of Canada. That is offensive to any reasonable definition of Canada.

• (2120)

Hon. members opposite are getting a little bit impatient. I recognize that it is not their role to read and understand the legislation before they cast a vote. That would be an intolerable burden for backbenchers of the Liberal Party.

If I might be permitted an aside, Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that we will probably never see electronic voting in this House so long as that party is in power. Could you imagine the chaos if hon. members opposite had to come up and vote electronically all by themselves without the example of their leader saying, "This is what to do; follow me."? They would have to think whether to vote for or against a particular motion. The situation would be chaotic if backbenchers opposite had to come here and listen to speeches now and again to know what is going on. That is, those who can read might have to do that.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that through the amendment the government brought in tonight—which was our amendment on second reading—calling for a six months' hoist it shows responsiveness by exempting electrical power from the cancellation of contracts on the basis of public convenience. However, by failing to show the same responsiveness to the concerns of oil and gas producers it has shown it is still not a Government of Canada in a complete sense, but a government of a very narrow part of Canada.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a statement that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) made. He spoke about 25-year licences for the