

exercise. But I do not think it is a proper function for the federal government to act like big daddy by clubbing provinces into submission.

At the first ministers' conference the federal government appeared to be saying there should be a price increase. The Premier of Ontario said there could be no price increase. It would seem to me that if this legislation had already been passed, the interests of Ontario as expressed by its premier would certainly have been adversely affected since the producing provinces and the federal government could have imposed a price unilaterally on the largest consuming province. So it could work both ways.

As it happens, the minister only mentions the consumers; he never at any time mentions the interests of the producers or the importance of security of supply of petroleum products to the country, a subject which should be of great concern to any hon. member who is called Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

At any rate we are considering how we should rewrite that part of our constitution which deals with the ownership and sale of our natural resources. Though the legislation before us deals with oil and gas we can readily think of other products in various regions of the country in which the federal government would be equally interested. I am amazed by the attitude of the minister when he says he needs a proclamation available at the snap of his fingers. Surely the basis on which the bill is presented envisages a period of negotiation between the federal government and the other parties which are interested in the price of oil and gas. This is vital to the interests of the consuming provinces as well as to those of the producing provinces. If there is to be any degree of meaningful negotiation between the parties, this process will take some time. If there is any validity to Division I, time will surely not be an important factor.

Consider the situation in which the minister now finds himself. The hon. gentleman says he has been suffering for the last 18 months because this legislation has not been passed. I cannot see how the people of Canada as a whole have suffered, though possibly the people of my province have suffered to the extent that by reason of the policies followed by the government they have contributed two or three billion dollars over the last couple of years toward the welfare of the rest of the country. I do not see how the minister could say he had suffered in this situation.

It is clear that the owners and consumers of energy resources have acted in the spirit of confederation, and acted accordingly without a club hanging over their heads. This, to my mind, is the way in which things should proceed. However, the government believes it has to rewrite the constitution, leaving the owners of the resources with no say in the matter.

I believe my hon. friend from Calgary North has shown himself to be in a very generous and expansive mood this afternoon; it is a serious mistake on the part of the minister not to take him up on his offer. What are two days of debate anyway? What point of view can one get across in Canada in two days? But it does allow something to be said about the relative merits of the arguments, and it will oblige the government to offer some justification for making the proclamation. It is only reasonable that the

Oil and Petroleum

minister should accept the amendment as proposed and as further amended in an unofficial way by the hon. member for Calgary North. It does not say much for the bona fides of the government and its respect for the idea of co-operative federalism if the minister continues to ignore these proposals. Division will not be used if the government is just given a loaded gun in Division II to use in any way it likes.

We have been talking for the most part about actions which are adverse to the producers of the resources. In different circumstances this weapon could be used to the detriment of the consumers of Canada since in terms of population there are a great many more consumers than producers. Serious consideration should be given to the matter before this clause is approved. The merits of the amendment should be carefully weighed. The matter should not be dealt with in too great a hurry.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I wonder if I could put on record a conversation between the hon. member for Peace River and myself? Since the hon. member for Calgary North did not put his suggestion in precise terms it might be useful to look at an appropriate form of words in this regard and, in order to do so, we might stand not only this clause but clause 36, to which several hon. members have put down amendments.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much.

Mr. Baldwin: The minister seems to accept that there might be some way in which parliament might intervene between the beginning of the situation envisaged by this clause and the time it came into effect. It is a matter of how this is done and the length of time involved, so I think we might stand these two clauses.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that clauses 35 and 36 be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clauses 35 and 36 stand.

Clauses 37 to 40 inclusive agreed to.

● (1520)

Clause 41 agreed to.

An hon. Member: On division.

Clause 42 agreed to.

An hon. Member: On division.

On clause 43—*Purchase price.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment which was circulated to hon. members, and I have a second amendment which I will circulate that arises from the remarks made yesterday by the hon. member for Calgary Centre. The first amendment is:

That Bill C-32 be amended by striking out lines 38 and 39 on page 17 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"the purchase is made"

The effect of the amendment would be to delete the final phrase of the subclause, and by so doing we would hope to remove an area fertile for ambiguity. The sub-