

another way, a positive way of using the private sector, Mr. Speaker. It is a much more efficient way than using government. We would encourage development, we would encourage investment, and we would encourage the creation of jobs at a time when that is so important.

Which way should we be going? I ask members on the government side to tell me why the approach proposed in Motion No. 21 cannot be considered. It is a more positive approach to Canadianization than the negative approach that the government has taken.

Mr. Evans: Give us specifics.

Mr. Wilson: There is a very clear and specific provision in Motion No. 21, and I hope the hon. member opposite will speak to it. I ask hon. members opposite to tell us why they think this motion is not appropriate. I asked the minister, and he said that we have a difference of opinion on it. I have given him my reasons why I think the approach taken in Bill C-48 is not appropriate, so I think I am entitled to expect that hon. members opposite will tell me why they think Motion No. 21 is not appropriate.

Members on the government side and in the NDP have said that Norway does this. Norway is not Canada, Mr. Speaker; it is a country that consumes about 15 per cent or 20 per cent of its oil and gas reserves. We in Canada import 15 per cent or 20 per cent, while Norway exports about 80 per cent of its oil. It can afford to take a different position and to risk that the private sector will cut back its involvement in the industry. Norway can afford to turn off development and take more aggressive attitudes than we can. We cannot afford to take that position. We need the oil.

If the government were serious about the objectives of self-sufficiency in oil, it would not bring Bill C-48 forward in its present form.

That is the basis for Motion No. 21, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will receive an adequate response from hon. members opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss this very important motion, Motion No. 21, and to connect it with Motion No. 22. The motion is concerned with the development of our resources to the maximum, in the most efficient manner, and with the least amount of intrusion by government.

Without these amendments, the government will continue to govern in an inequitable way. One industry will be singled out for unfair treatment.

Essentially what we have to deal with is the theft, by confiscation, of 25 per cent of northern lands, irrespective of who did the initial development and exploration work. No matter what private company, Canadian or international, did the work, by writing a regulation, the government has established that it can claim 25 per cent of whatever is produced without paying any compensation. No other industry in

Canada Oil and Gas Act

Canada is subject to such harassment by the federal government.

I cannot help but believe that this is a reflection of the bias of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). It shows his disdain for western Canada, a disdain which is reiterated in his speeches and his personal attacks on the regions of Canada.

An hon. Member: Sick!

Mr. Malone: An hon. member opposite says "sick". I would like to share with him something that I believe to be far worse. Just two nights ago, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources spoke in Sherbrooke, Quebec. A report of that speech reads as follows:

Lalonde said a stronger threat to Canadian unity than Quebec nationalism could soon be posed by the growing wealth of Alberta.

Canada, he said, could one day become a country with one rich province imposing its whims on the other nine if Alberta uses its billions to take control of foreign companies and the federal government does not maintain its role of enforcing the sharing of wealth between rich and poor provinces.

The other nine provinces would eventually be at the mercy of Alberta's every fancy, he said, and a wave of (Alberta) nationalism of unprecedented strength could rise up if the federal government held back now from showing its teeth. "We don't pay enough attention to this threat" Lalonde said, "but it's a real one, it's there."

I submit that it is wrong to pick out one province and say that it is a threat to national unity. It suggests that that province is not willing to share. It flies in the face of everything that has been talked about with regard to the Constitution in the last 15 months. Federalism cannot work when the major player, the federal government, singles out one region and tries to draw the anger of the rest of the country against it.

The fact is that Alberta has a product that is worth world price, and it has negotiated with the federal government to sell that product at 75 per cent of its value within the next five years. To date, Alberta has contributed \$30 billion to confederation by selling its product at less than world price. I submit that no other region in Canada can make such a claim.

The government claims that it will Canadianize the oil industry. This industry is located essentially in one region of Canada and that is not central Canada. When the government uses the term "Canadianize", it twists the language. It is really referring to a program of nationalization. This proposal was made in the same year that the government gave a guaranteed loan of \$240 million to Chrysler Corporation and in the same year that it took Massey-Ferguson close to its breast to help it out. The unique difference between these multinational companies is that Massey-Ferguson and Chrysler are located in central Canada, while the oil industry is located away from the centre.

● (1520)

The people across this land do not mind the objective stated in the new energy program if it means a greater degree of Canadianization; but we do not have Canadianization, we have nationalization. We have nationalization of that industry which is located away from the centre. It was very much