

Canadian consumers and thus goes on alleviating the adverse effect of sudden and unpredictable increases in OPEC prices. I cannot understand the theoretical or practical justification of those who would like to impose world oil and gas prices upon Canadian consumers. How can a totally artificially established price by an international trust be desirable from an economic point of view when applied to the domestic consumption of a domestically produced good?

Should the economic value of a good produced and consumed in the country not be more in line with domestic production costs rather than with the ups and downs of international politics? This is precisely what the national energy program tries to take into account through a blended price for oil consumed in Canada which will represent an average of offshore and domestic oil prices, and by establishing the price of natural gas based on domestic development costs. This policy, Mr. Speaker, results in an increase in oil prices in Canada which will be phased in and predictable, in shifting the burden of subsidizing costly oil imports, from taxpayers to consumers, which should promote our economy and finally, in the Canadian industry maintaining a substantial competitive advantage.

This competitive advantage of Canadian industry as regards oil prices is essential to offset the disadvantages that our hard climate and long distances might represent for our economy as regards energy costs. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the people of a rural area like Bellechasse, far from domestic markets, are really anxious that the Canadian industry should keep its competitive advantage as regards oil prices. All the more so, Mr. Speaker, since no country which produces 75 per cent of the petroleum products it needs, such as Canada, has so far found justification for selling to its own people at international prices.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, the issue of petroleum and gas prices is of course linked to the question of sharing revenues. To the same extent as a ceiling on prices, sharing the petroleum tax dollars is an equitable measure which fully reflects Canadian tradition. Those who object to the new energy program and its sharing provisions never fail to argue that the federal government is trying to take over provincial natural resources through budgetary measures.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the federal perspective contains nothing about property rights but only income sharing. The arguments of those who are against the new energy program do not hold before the extraordinary powers which some of them claim to discredit the program. And to do that they must certainly enjoy mighty powerful property rights which have not been whittled down. But, Mr. Speaker, we in the federal government are convinced that no matter how powerful they may be property rights do not immunize against the obligation to share which is inherent in federalism. We are convinced that all Canadians without exception, wherever they live in Canada, are entitled to their share of Canada's rich energy

inheritance regardless of where the natural resources are located. We are convinced that it is a national inheritance from which each and every one must benefit in keeping with the sharing principle so essential to federalism. We are convinced that all Canadians, not only those who reside in the producing provinces, have worked as a team to develop their oil industry. Capital, technology and manpower have flowed from all parts of Canada toward the producing provinces.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being 9:45 p.m., it is my duty pursuant to order made Tuesday, October 28, 1980, to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The question is on the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. MacEachen) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 21)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand	Chrétien	Duclos
Appolloni	Collenette	Dupont
(Mrs.)	Comtois	Dupras
Axworthy	Corbin	Duquet
Bachand	Corriveau	Erola (Mrs.)
Baker	Cosgrove	Ethier
(Gander-Twillingate)	Côté (Mrs.)	Evans
Beauchamp-Niquet	Cousineau	Ferguson
(Mrs.)	Cyr	Fisher
Bégin (Miss)	Dawson	Fleming
Berger	De Bané	Flis
Blais	de Corneille	Foster
Blaker	Demers	Fox
Bloomfield	Deniger	Francis
Bockstael	Desmarais	Garant
Bossy	Dingwall	Gauthier
Breau	Dion	Gendron
Bujold	Dionne	Gimatiel
Bussièrès	(Chicoutimi)	Gingras
Campbell	Dionne	Gourd
(Miss)	(Northumberland- Miramichi)	Gray
(South West Nova)	Dubois	Guilbault
Chénier		Harquail