

Canada Oil and Gas Act

The reality probably is the same for most in the Atlantic provinces as well. The article states:

—provincial resource control to most westerners today is perhaps as important in a jurisdictional sense as language and culture are to francophone Quebecers, because resources give us for the first time an opportunity to become full partners in our own country. The federal assault on the oil and natural gas of the three mostly westerly provinces, under what the government insists is a “national” energy policy, is to many of us the equivalent of parking tanks on a fellow countryman’s front lawn.

That is in economic terms. The quotation continues:

In terms of its effect on many western livelihoods, and on the goal of achieving national self-sufficiency in these two products—

These two Canadian products—they advertise on television telling us to “buy Canadian”, but oil and gas are not Canadian products, I gather, according to these turkeys. Gentlemen from rural ridings will know how turkeys are regarded among the animal kingdom.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member is straying a little from the amendment before us. I invite him to return to the subject of the amendment.

Mr. Kilgour: I guess the rest of my speech, Mr. Speaker, does not really relate to the motion. How much time do I have?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: About five minutes.

Mr. Kilgour: I take it the Chair is enforcing the relevance rule tonight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: These attempts to enforce the rules are strictly impartial on all occasions.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, my respect for the rules and the Chair is such that I will not continue to deal in irrelevancies. I would ask, sir, that in future when people get up and talk about anything except the bill or the matter before the House, the Chair will impose the rule with the same vigour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The chair recognizes the difficulty in always being consistent, but does its best.

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the Chair will ignore the hon. member’s last remark. I should like to start off by complimenting my colleague, the hon. member for St. John’s East, (Mr. McGrath) on his motion that we are debating today. It is one of tremendous importance for people who live in coastal provinces. I am glad it is before us and is so well debated, with the odd exception.

I thought the parliamentary secretary was somewhat irrelevant. He was talking about its not being the intention of the government of Canada to strip the resources from the provinces. He should recall what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) said last year when he was touring Canada. He was asked why the government was so keen on imposing the strict regime it was imposing on Alberta. He remarked, “We need the money, and you get the money where the money is.” With remarks like that coming from cabinet ministers it is very

difficult for people to accept the statement that it is not Canada’s intention to strip any of the resources from the provinces.

I was impressed by the speech last night by my colleague the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen). He made some comments about the New Democratic Party energy critic. I took particular note of them when I read his speech over today. My colleague mentioned that this 38-year-old adolescent, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), had avoided giving any idea of the position of his province. He claimed to be speaking for his province several times during his speech, but not once did he mention what the province of British Columbia has in the way of a policy concerning resources. I thought he might at least have given us Mr. Barrett’s policy on the resources in British Columbia, but he managed to avoid both.

● (2050)

I believe the hon. member is setting a new record in the House of Commons for spurious and irrelevant points of order and questions of privilege. He may well end up in the Guinness Book of World Records over this, but he comes by it honestly. I believe he inherited it from his predecessor, Mrs. Simma Holt, who is noted for the same characteristics. Hon. members will recall that Mr. Speaker Jerome used to be very fast when the then hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway rose on a question of privilege. We used to time her at about 90 seconds before she would be asked to sit down so that the House could go about its ordinary business.

I agree there were some good points in the hon. member’s speech about the attitude British Columbia has to its tidewaters and the waters particularly between Vancouver Island and the mainland. Except when the usual NDP anti-American paranoia crept in, the hon. member was making some sense. One should treasure it when it comes from that source.

I would like to remark that once again the Progressive Conservative Party is the only one left to speak for British Columbia or to advance British Columbia’s aims in this House, particularly in energy matters.

Let us look at the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) for a moment. The minister was accurately described by the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) when he said that Marc Lalonde would manage to pick a fight going to church in the morning. He did something similar in the House on March 12 when I asked him if he was aware of the effect his energy policy and his incursion by means of the excise tax into the natural gas market between British Columbia and the northwestern United States had on the budget in my home province, to which, in his usual fashion—although he was not on his way to church that day—he said:

Madam Speaker, I am only sorry that the hon. member believes the Sacred propaganda of that particular government in its budget.

One can see how this minister goes around rather like Typhoid Mary spreading discontent and abrasiveness everywhere he goes.