

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

the NDP a chance to come into this House and espouse their theoretical principles and their theoretical philosophy, because that philosophy forgets one basic ethic. One does not get anything in this world unless one is prepared to work for it. There is no free lunch, as we heard it said around here earlier.

What many of us have been trying to say in Bill C-48 is that one can have all the ministers of energy, mines and resources in the world trying to Canadianize the energy situation in Canada with Houdini's wand, but unless the basic philosophy of producer versus parasite is maintained, the mainstream that we in this House have been given will not continue.

I have been in this House for a few years. There are hon. members who are younger than I am. I will not become overly romantic or sentimental tonight about the heritage we have been given; but a heritage has been given to this country. The two solitudes exist because of the political framework and the make-up of this House of Commons. We would not have this debate in the House of Commons had there been, in the old days of Mackenzie King and St. Laurent, some strong spokesmen in this House from the varied regions of Canada. The government cannot nominate to the upper chamber these political eunuchs who are supposed to be the spokesmen of the main regions of this country. It needs the Stewart Garsons and the Jimmy Gardiners who were Liberals in the classical sense. It needs to balance those voices against those in the time of John Diefenbaker, strong voices from all parts of this country. This press of ours is so mesmerized by television that it does not take the time to really study some of the underlying philosophical and political currents which are affecting this country. It will never get the handle on the federal-provincial conferences coming up.

**An hon. Member:** Tommy Douglas.

**Mr. Nowlan:** I have the fullest respect for Tommy Douglas. The parliamentary secretary—or undersecretary, because he is so far under the secretary of energy, mines and resources, yet he is a fine man in the publishing world—is supposed to do something about Canadian history. However, unless there are people of his ilk who have consciences and some appreciation of history, I am saying in all seriousness tonight that this country, regardless of what happens on Monday or Tuesday, will not be here in my children's time. That is how serious I feel the situation to be.

I implore hon. members on the opposite side and members of the NDP, who come from a pretty homogeneous group to understand that it takes government members who have serious questions about either the Constitution or Bill C-48 to get a proper perspective, not the smug perspective that radiated tonight from the face of the secretary for energy, mines and resources. Unless hon. members of this House of Commons can get a wider perspective than the narrow constituency one, unfortunately, as this House is divided, I am not optimistic about what will happen to this country. I am an Irish Canadian, a Nova Scotian who has been conditioned to be optimistic about anything, because I have had to be.

**Mr. Waddell:** You must have kissed the Blarney stone, too, eh, Pat?

**Mr. Nowlan:** However, I am not going to go down those rabbit trails of public advocates who have yet to earn their hard dollar in the world of law. After one gets three years of Tommy Berger on that commission in the north, one can come into the House of Commons as knowledgeable in energy as is the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). Regardless of that, I am not talking about individuals; I am talking about a national scene and, frankly, a national sickness. Unless we can start to reflect on the reasons we are here, that it is free enterprise, that it is producer versus parasite, that it is not just profit or penalty, not just bureaucracy and no lack of respect for the business, we will have continuing difficulty here. The fundamental of Canadianization, as much as we want to philosophize in this House, is the right of a Canadian to have his home, to have his family and to have his job. Unless we start to think in that sort of simplistic, general, but fundamental way, we will be debating Bill C-48 and the problems of Canada until the cows come home.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

● (2150)

**Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, in the short period of time left to me prior to the calling of ten o'clock, I will not endeavour to get into the specifics of this legislation as have so many of my colleagues before me. I will leave the energy field to them because they are more knowledgeable than I. However, in speaking to Motion No. 21 before us pertaining to clause 27 in Bill C-48, I would like to philosophize somewhat on the implications of what we stand for in our motion as compared to what the other two parties stand for.

I have found in the seven years that I have served in this House of Commons that the members on the government benches opposite have been so preoccupied with the redistribution of wealth that they have given no concern to the generation of wealth. Unless we have generation of wealth here in Canada, Canadians will suffer. I can think of no better example to share with the House than the budget that we introduced and on which we were defeated in December, 1979.

There are many philosophical undertones to that budget. We have a deep belief in the Canadian individual who built this country. Individuals built this country, not governments. Governments simply take from the people. In our budget of December, 1979, it is interesting to note that we were reducing the government budgetary deficit and government spending. The social policy planning board of Canada indicated that it was the most socially progressive budget that had been introduced in Canada in the ten years prior.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!