

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

will not be resolved with technical and legal arguments. It is truly a political matter. We have to be able to talk it out in this House if we are to understand our position as people living in widely diverse regions in a vast land.

I hear again the moans and groans of the people from Upper and Lower Canada, and I tell you there is trouble ahead if you do not open your ears and retain some of the appeals we keep trying to make. We will fracture into tribes such as those in Africa if the government does not listen, does not hear, does not get back to the bargaining table, does not negotiate and does not work to reach a consensus.

Arrogance and autocracy are absolutely obsolete today. They are obsolete in the work place. They cause all the confrontation we have between management and labour. They are obsolete in national politics. This country needs some gentle, loving care. It needs some talking; it needs to talk out our differences, it needs to reach and negotiate an understanding, and it needs to get back to the processes leading to consensus.

● (1740)

There are more intelligent ways of achieving the National Energy Program objectives than confrontation, confiscation and the very dishonest use of the word Canadianization. I urge the government to return to consensus-seeking procedures, for in my opinion the wellbeing of our country, Canada, is at stake, and the federal Liberal government's zeal to federalize is betraying the Atlantic regions and the western regions of Canada.

In the moment I have left I will return to the words "equity" and "sharing" because those are essential elements of this debate. It is in the interests of all Canadians, we keep hearing, that we move on the Canada lands. Let me tell hon. members that of the present price of \$1.66 for a gallon of gasoline, the federal government, according to figures provided by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson), takes 56 cents; the Ontario government takes 25 cents; the Alberta government gets 22.7 cents; the producer gets 19.3 cents; the refiner gets 33 cents; and the dealer gets 10 cents. This adds up to \$1.66.

Hon. members opposite keep talking about the interests of all Canadians. They keep thinking that this country will stay together as a co-operative federalist state. They talk about equity and fair sharing being the motivation which drives them to these types of policies, but nothing could be further from the truth or more divisive.

The Canada lands concept is a serious issue to the Atlantic regions and to the western regions. The definitions within the legislation are not known; nor is this amendment known to my province; and I urge hon. members opposite to go slowly so that full and studied input is available from our regions before this legislation goes too much further in this House. There are other matters we can be debating, matters such as concurrence in the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments, which would give us time to get our regional inputs together on this important bill.

**Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow on the remarks of my colleague, the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), and to support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath).

The matter before the House today boils down to one basic question: who owns the resources under the Canada lands? In particular, with respect to motion No. 3 we are dealing with the question of who owns the resource potential in the offshore areas in the Atlantic and Pacific coastal regions.

I would like to quote from the National Energy Program just briefly as referred to at page 42 where it is indicated that the federal government recognizes the difficult nature of this dispute. In fact, the government claims, in the very meritorious-sounding document released almost a year ago, that it is anxious to refer the matter of ownership quickly to the Supreme Court. The document states the following:

Uncertainty about the legal control over such vital areas is not conducive to the rapid development of the oil and gas potential of this promising region, which can contribute to Canada's energy needs and the economic aspirations of the region.

All that sounds great. That is very high sounding rhetoric, but it is completely contradicted in the initiative reflected in Bill C-48, which would allow the federal government to lay claim, without constitutional amendment or legal clarification by the courts, to all those potential resources in the Canada lands areas without any provision for revenue sharing with the provinces, let alone recognition of the fact of provincial ownership as a basic aspect of those regions' entering into Confederation, and without any regard for provincial involvement in the management and development decisions in those Canada lands.

What we are dealing with is a federal attitude which treats the north, the west, our Atlantic provinces and British Columbia as colonies, as the hon. member for Capilano has stated, and the sole *raison d'être* for those colonies is to serve the central provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This is the view of this centralist government. The more remote regions of Canada are there merely to be raped and exploited by the Liberal plunderers.

These far flung regions of Canada are soon going to revolt against the power hungry, selfish attitude of the federal government. The federal philosophy seems to presume that regional growth and prosperity are wrong, because the government itself has contradicted the high sounding rhetoric of the National Energy Program. However, the truth is that decisions taken in the regions are very much superior to decisions taken 3,000 miles away in Ottawa by a group of uninformed bureaucrats and greedy Liberal squanderers. There is absolutely no evidence to justify the federal claim that it can do a better job of managing our natural resources than the provinces have done over the last several decades.

Let us examine the credentials of these centralists, these economic socialists whose narrow attitude toward Canada is reflected on the editorial pages of the Ottawa *Citizen* but hardly anywhere else in the country. What have they done