

*Oil and Petroleum*

control our destiny if we cannot even discipline ourselves to control today's domestic developments. Is it not reasonable to expect the same standards of conduct in legislatures that citizens expect of one another?

I come now to another question in respect of which I will insert some general comments later on. I ask myself: how is this total issue related to changing world conditions with regard to energy and to the squeeze that developing nations are feeling today with regard to their inability to pay high prices for commodities they need in order to grow food? Well, as commodity prices have escalated and as inflationary trends have worsened in general, we have witnessed a growing tendency on the part of many nations, both developed and developing, to take whatever they can get—a spirit of protecting one's own position whatever the cost to others. There is certainly not much evidence of a philanthropic feeling abroad in the world today. It would appear to me that much of our current debate in regard to non-renewable resources in Canada reflects this politically hostile environment on the international scene.

There is a reluctance on the part of the industrialized nations to provide assistance on a scale commensurate with the needs of the third world; there is a reluctance on the part of the OPEC nations to share their newly-found largesse with less fortunate members of our global society; and there is a reluctance on the part of many developing nations to undertake those social reforms which would be beneficial to improving their own lot. In a time when the need for international co-operation has never been as great, and in a time when the problems of population growth, of food supply, of poverty and of resource development have never been so paramount, there is a conspicuous lack of concern, a lack of willingness to assist.

On the other hand, it is also fair to say that any nation undergoing considerable economic and other problems will be hard pressed to help others. The United States, for example, which will have paid out approximately \$25 billion during the course of 1974 to import oil, obviously will be less psychologically disposed toward assisting less fortunate countries. In Canada, to the extent that we can avoid or at least ameliorate our coming problems, whether in the field of oil and gas supply or elsewhere, by means of intelligent, comprehensive and long-term planning, to that extent will we be better placed to extend assistance to the developing countries.

In other words, what I am saying is that our own house must be in order if we are effectively to work beyond our own national sphere and assume our international responsibilities. It is difficult to move promised grain supplies to lands with starving peoples if that grain cannot move across the country or cannot move through the St. Lawrence Seaway because of strikes. It is difficult to talk about entering an international energy agreement when we cannot settle an energy dispute internally. In short, until such time as we repair some of the damage that has been done in this country to the faith of the individual and of private enterprise in the astuteness and leadership of our legislative bodies, it will be most difficult to put together the wherewithal to help those members of our global society who are in mounting need of such assistance and who are progressively less well disposed to wait for that assistance.

[Mr. Roche.]

I come now to another question: how can these responsibilities at the federal and provincial levels be reconciled, and how can we bring these governments together? At least in the case of oil, this debate will in some ways become academic within ten years. At that time oil exports will presumably have been phased out and the domestic price of oil in Canada will be nearer, or at, the world price. We may not like that prognosis, but it seems to represent what our current appreciation of the supply situation is telling us. At the moment, and assuming that the federal and provincial governments could amicably come together, there is considerable flexibility in the manner in which this issue could be handled. If, on the other hand, this issue should proceed to the courts, one side will to all intents and purposes win and the other side will lose. There would certainly be less flexibility in dealing with such problems if that were to occur, and whatever flexibility there might be would largely depend upon whether or not the winning side chose to be magnanimous in its victory.

This current flexibility of negotiation I regard as an asset. I do not believe that a court decision in favour of one side or the other would result in light and understanding; rather, it might institutionalize a bitterness which we at least at the moment have the opportunity of overcoming. In view of reconciling federal and provincial interests and responsibilities, I suggest that both levels of government have fair claim to some of these formerly completely unanticipated revenues. They have the responsibility of not making excessive claims in the process; they have the responsibility of ensuring that private enterprise is not emasculated in the process; and they have the responsibility of avoiding the temptation to legislate everything that they can lay their hands on. I would reiterate my earlier point, that citizens in a democratic society should be allowed to function with the minimum of laws necessary for good governance.

I see it is five o'clock, and I would be willing, Mr. Chairman, to suspend my remaining comments until after supper. I would ask the minister to return following the supper hour because the questions which I shall put in detail will require answers by him.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I did not hear the hon. gentleman. Will he repeat what he said?

**Mr. Baldwin:** He was saying he hoped you would have a good supper and come back and reply nicely to him.

● (1700)

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I have a meeting with the provincial ministers this evening, but I will put it off in order to be present and hear the hon. gentleman.

**The Chairman:** It being five o'clock, it is my duty to leave the chair in order that the House may proceed to the consideration of private members' business. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Progress reported.