

Petroleum Administration Act

revenue sharing and the pricing of our natural resources. Balancing the constitutional ownership of the resources by the provinces against the federal government's moral and constitutional obligations in interprovincial and international trade, has not been easy.

In conclusion, we in this House express the political differences which democracy and the parliamentary system bring with them. However, outside we must remember that it is not just a voter to whom we are speaking; it is a Canadian, a cousin. Certainly I acknowledge the right of the opposition to criticize the program of the government. I will disagree with them, but it is their right and duty. As we on this side of the House go out and about this land, we will attempt to explain what the energy program means to the individual in dollars and cents. We will defend this policy and attempt to convert people to our cause. But, there is a greater cause. I ask opposition members to go out and, in their way, criticize the program if they must, but at all turns to defend Canada and not to allow the nation to be torn apart for a few resource points, for a few extra dollars. It will be a sad legacy of the House if we allow the country to be sold down the river for a few pieces of silver.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, it is with some trepidation and sadness that I rise to address the House on this motion which protests the proclamation of section 36 of the Petroleum Administration Act. It is with a degree of sadness because the very fact of the implementation of this motion reflects a lack of trust and a lack of realism toward the petroleum industry, the producing provinces and the people from the part of Canada which I represent.

The freedoms we in this country enjoy are very precious and also very fragile. To my way of thinking, those freedoms are entrenched in the fact that individuals can advance and work in a society, not unduly encumbered by a central interventionist government which would repeatedly impose tax upon tax, collecting massive amounts of money through Ottawa, taking them with one hand, and then in a very gratuitous manner, as the previous speaker and the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola) indicated, giving us back but a pitiful portion of those funds. This interventionist philosophy is reflected in a document entitled "The Practice and Theory of Federalism" which was written some years ago by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). In introducing a section on strategy and tactics, the Prime Minister indicated that "revolution and revolutionary wars proceed from birth to development, from small to large, from lack of power to seizure of power". It was a quotation from Mao Tse-tung, and immediately thereafter the Prime Minister indicated that if the whole of the Canadian electorate could miraculously be converted to socialist ideals at one fell swoop, there would be no reason to discuss strategy in the present context; socialism would be achieved with or without federalism and socialist administrations would be installed at every level of government affairs, no matter the form of the constitution. That is the fright which faces me and which faces

my children, including one of my sons who is here today in the gallery, whose future and freedom within our society is very much at stake in the matter of this debate.

The need for the implementation of the Petroleum Administration Act is predicated on Liberal myths and scare tactics directed against western premiers, petroleum industries, and, by inference, all the people of western Canada. I want to make it very clear at this point that Canadians who live in the western parts of this country are neither selfish nor separatists. We do not take lightly to being accused of either, but Canadians in the west rightly feel alienated from a mammoth centralist government some 1,500 to 3,000 miles away which does not try to understand their way of life. The nub of the problem is that the Trudeau Liberals and their good socialist friends to my left are distorting the real meaning of the word "sharing". I believe—and I think most western Canadians believe—that sharing is an act of giving and receiving in a spirit of mutual goodwill. It is a voluntary thing. Sharing is not legalized theft and undue and disproportionate taxation. That is how the communists share. Western Canadians already share generously with all their fellow Canadians through direct equalization payments and a number of other forms of economic concession to central and eastern Canada, for example, as reflected in the preferential purchasing policies of the Department of Supply and Services, the use of DREE grants, protective tariffs, subsidised freight rates, and even certain biases in the UIC system and welfare program. I and western Canadians believe we are entitled to know the cost of that sharing.

At a committee meeting two weeks ago, the Prime Minister refused to tell Canadians the costs the people who are doing the sharing have to bear because of the heavy hand of the central Liberal government. Our concept of sharing is a far cry from the definition of the Prime Minister. The concept of sharing expressed by his insensitive colleagues, particularly those on the front benches who are not in their places today, amounts to a unilateral confiscation of provincial resource revenues without even making a fair and serious attempt to negotiate.

● (1550)

Mr. Speaker, I want to give an illustration of the tragedy that I think faces our country and the reason I am saddened with respect to our future. After the vote on Wednesday night, when the government denied the opportunity to oppose the implementation of the Petroleum Administration Act under the previous motion, I rode an elevator in the West Block. In the elevator I was surrounded by a boisterous group of Liberal backbenchers. They may not have thought I understood what they were saying. They were very happy and jovial. They displayed a smug cockiness which alarmed me, Mr. Speaker. What they were so excited about was that they had stuck it to Peter Lougheed. They thought they had stuck it to a few western Conservative members of Parliament. They were acting like alleycats that got the mouse. They were so proud of themselves, Mr. Speaker. I must tell the House today that that laughter was not directed just at a couple of premiers in western Canada, or a couple of Conservative members of