

the bill in July. The long, hot summer months have not changed my opinion of this bill.

Unfortunately, even though I do not like the legislation, it is an important piece of legislation, and I think can only compare with the Constitution reference in the effects it will have on this country. I was fortunate to be one of the members to sit on both the constitution and natural resources committees. The country showed great interest in appearing before both committees. It has been said before that some 135 hours was spent studying Bill C-48 in the committee. There were about 140 witnesses. It is interesting to note that of all those witnesses that appeared before the committee in regard to Bill C-48, I do not believe one of them agreed with the general contents or the details of this bill. There was a great deal of opposition to the bill. Most of the people who appeared before the committee sensed what was happening and how important this legislation was.

Perhaps the importance of this legislation has been overlooked by the press and the country. We should know and be aware that it has not been overlooked by the government. Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) said when he introduced this program. He said:

This new program will impinge on almost every sphere of Canadian activity, on the fortunes of every Canadian, and on the economic and social structure of the nation for years to come.

The minister has at least been honest in telling the Canadian people what he is trying to do. I think we ignore him at our peril, just as we in his country and other countries ignored Adolf Hitler when he tried to warn us what he was about to do. I think we should pay clear attention to what the minister intends to do, because he said that this legislation will impinge on the fortunes of every Canadian. Surely those are true and accurate words.

The opposition parties on the committee put forth many amendments during the committee stage. This is proof that the bill was far from perfect when it was first presented. It is an indication of the government's railroading of this bill and others that they did not accept one single amendment at the committee stage. No one can convince me that all those amendments were bad and were not pertinent to the problems that were brought out at the committee stage. We are now debating a large number of those amendments. We should debate them slowly and carefully, so that the people of this country are fully aware of what drastic changes this legislation will bring.

Motion No. 21 reads as follows:

(2) Her Majesty in right of Canada is hereby vested with and the minister on her behalf shall hold a share sufficient to render the interest holder with a Canadian ownership rate of 50 per cent.

This motion directs itself to ownership and to Canadianization. Canadianization, like motherhood, is something we all agree with. It is a word often used, and I suggest maligned, by the government in support of this particular measure.

The Conservative party, of course, is in favour of Canadianization. I am sure even the NDP is in favour of Canadianiza-

tion, as is everyone in Canada, but not the kind of Canadianization practised by this government. We are in favour of Canadianization. We are not in favour of socialization and we are not in favour of nationalization, and this is what Bill C-48 is all about.

The debate on Bill C-48 at the committee level and in this House, and the debate on the Constitution at the committee level and in this House, really stems and flows from an essential difference in philosophy between this side of the House, the Conservative party, and the governing party. The government has indicated quite clearly, through its legislation, both proposed and in progress, that they favour a centralized, unitary form of government, central control, control of resources by the government. In fact, they have indicated they are prepared to go quite a long way down the road to socialism in order to achieve their goal.

The Conservative party has consistently defended the federal nature of this country; the free enterprise, economic nature that we have been adopting so successfully throughout our history. We indicated, and we still feel, that the government perhaps should play the role of umpire, but they should not be a player. That is what Bill C-48 is attempting to make them in the oil industry.

Over the past year and a half to two years, we have had what one might consider a one-two punch. The first punch was the attempt at legislative control by the Constitution; the second punch is by this legislation. Both of them are leading toward socialization. If the House thinks I am wrong in that respect, let me ask the question, why is not the right to own private property in the constitutional reference? The answer to that question clearly shows what the government intends.

The provinces have fought the Constitution and they are now fighting the effects of the national energy policy. The provinces recognize that this oil policy is an attempt to grab their resources, and in fact it does do that. As the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) said, what next? Will it be the forest industry in B.C., the mining industry, or the fishing industry? Anything and everything is subject to their claims and to their capacity to legislate control if it is not stopped here.

You may wonder Mr. Speaker why we on this side of the House are so opposed to government control. Let me tell you why. In the past 15 years the government has bungled everything rather badly. I want to read into *Hansard* a summary of that bungling which says it better than I can say it. It is an article by Douglas Fisher in *The Toronto Sun* of October 26, 1981. He is speaking about Mirabel airport. He says:

They who gave us Mirabel airport also managed the post office into its disastrous inefficiency.

A week ago a House committee dominated by Liberal MPs sketched 15 years of mismanagement and null achievement in manpower training.

This week the Dubin inquiry revealed an air administration that is ineffective and supervising unsafe practices galore.

The VIA Rail fiasco has quickly become legendary.

And he goes on. Mr. Speaker, that is why I am very much opposed to the legislation before the House. Certainly it will