

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

Because current world prices have escalated to such dizzying heights, Mr. Speaker, and in such a relatively short period of time, the federal government is once again trying to apply what I call "some special treatment to exceptional circumstances". That is what we have now, exceptional circumstances, to which we are trying to apply some special treatment.

Canada was built because people were willing to share with one another. Once again we are trying to establish domestic prices, this time domestic prices for our energy resources. These are prices which will be different from world prices, not in order to benefit Ottawa but in order to benefit all Canadians. This is not a new procedure, it has been done before. Based on other exceptional circumstances the federal government established pricing structures which were lower or higher than the world price to protect the needs of Canadians, not western Canadians necessarily, and not eastern Canadians, but all of us.

Remember that international copper prices rose sharply in 1969. But we kept the Canadian prices low and we restrained exports to ensure that Canadians were supplied first, and adequately. To me this was a sensible policy in order to take care of our own citizens. The year 1969 was a bumper year for these types of problems. When the international price of wheat plummeted, we legislated a minimum price per bushel of domestically consumed grain to protect the Canadian supplier. This was wheat which was produced primarily in the west. At that time it was a reasonable policy.

I note here that the 1969 experience with copper involved mainly copper from Ontario. So once again it was one part of the country having to carry the burden for another.

The energy issue has raised many questions in Canada about the rights and privileges of being a Canadian, about the responsibilities of governments at every level, and the wisdom of federal policies related to energy. I add here that this Canadianism, as I understand it, is one where we say we are willing, at some time in our development, to share those things which we have with our fellow citizens. Where is the conflict with respect to that? Is it because we want to be at each other's throats? Is it because we want to say that what is mine is mine and what is yours is mine? No, not that at all. What we are trying to say and what we are trying to do is to build this nation.

We have lived through 113 years with conflicts. We have just come through one of the most heart-wrenching periods in the history of Canada, and I refer to the Quebec referendum. Many of my colleagues on this side of the House were there for that fight, and were there for many heart-wrenching experiences where families were split. We went through it together. We, the members of Parliament who are here, and those people in Quebec who had to be part of this, came through it. As a result, I believe we came out of it a little stronger.

I pray that this growing phenomenon, this growing sickness which we have now of separatism, whenever we disagree with the government, will come to an end. Surely we cannot expect

everyone to agree with everything all the time. That does not make sense. This is a democracy, and strong men and women will have different opinions and different ideas about different subjects at any given time in our development. So now, when we have a bit of disagreement why is it right away we say, "Separate. Let us get out of here"? Where will these people go? Where do they want to go? Do they want to set up their own little kingdom? Do they think they can live alone better than they can with a commonality, with a family which is Canada made up of Canadians?

When we were in conflict during the Second World War I never heard of anyone saying that they were fighting for Ontario alone, or fighting for Alberta alone. When they went over there they wore the uniform of Canada and, yes, when they made their sacrifices they made them for the whole country, not for just one little part. It is now left to us, in our heritage, to come face to face with the problems we have and to look at them squarely in the eye. For God's sake, it is not for us to say, "Separate, because we do not agree with you." This does not make sense. It is not reasonable. Surely we have come far enough together that we can reason together.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot understand one another or share what we have now, what chances have we got in the years ahead? What can we tell our children and our grandchildren? That we could not talk to each other? That we could not reach agreement? That we were more interested in owning things than in having a country of our own? Mr. Speaker, one must always ask oneself what is most important. What is more important today: to have a few dollars, to own more cars, more television sets and so on, or to have a country we can call our own, a country for us and our children? I say, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to talk to each other and to say: Now, listen: that's enough whining, enough shouting; time has come to listen and, as my hon. colleague said, to take positive steps for our country.

● (1620)

[*English*]

There is no argument that each province regulates natural resource activities within its borders. This has never been under dispute. The BNA Act delineates this fact very clearly. However, oil and gas are vital commodities. The well-being of the Canadian way of life is very dependent on both, and every consumer and every activity depend upon them. Because of this dependency, the federal government believes that all Canadians are now faced with exceptional circumstances which call for special treatment.

The special treatment really involves the federal government asking the people of the energy rich provinces to share their good fortune to ensure that adequate supplies of energy are available to all Canadians at reasonable prices and with reasonable surety. It seems to me that we should consider this kind of sharing as a privilege which is attendant on being a Canadian.