

Canada Oil and Gas Act

have introduced fiscal policies which would have added further value to our resource products. We could have introduced fiscal policies which would have replaced the incentive to work as well as the incentive to save back into our economy.

● (2030)

But under the regime that is radicalizing Canada, these entitlements have been denied the Canadian people and the people of western Canada. Instead we have received a plethora of regulations and legislation which is increasing the frustration and anxiety levels of the people. We have policies which aggravate and irritate, policies which heighten the frustration levels of our people, policies which deliberately create tensions, and policies which create heavy and unnecessary regulatory and paper burdens on us. We have policies which deliver more power and control to committees, tribunals, commissions and bureaucrats. We have policies which collectivize, drown and smother the individual and the private sector. Why? The answer is that it must be deliberate. They are the policies of socialists who are now in control. They are the policies of people who have infiltrated the Liberal Party of Canada, the once defender of the individual and of individualism in this country.

Mr. Nielsen: It no longer exists.

Mr. Huntington: We have radical policies which go beyond the wildest dreams of the left wing of the New Democratic Party. We have policies which deliver frustration, bitterness, division and the regional antagonism which is so intense and growing at such a frightening rate in this country.

Socialism can only be created from unrest and crisis amongst the masses, and Clause 27 of this bill is right at the heart of that. A socialist state cannot be created when people are at work, when they are achieving goals and when they are able to pay for their homes and their private property. That has been denied the people by the government, and that is what we are debating in Motions Nos. 21 and 22, which would amend Clause 27 of the proposed Canada Oil and Gas Act.

A terrible shame lies on those Canadians whose political perception is no deeper than the thickness of a paper label. Canadianization in the sense of Canadian people owning 50 per cent of their oil and gas resource industries—yes. That would allow us to provide the pension plans necessary to relieve the burden on a reducing population in our work force, but nationalization and confiscation—no.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: Britain's professor Flores said this:

The private sector can be defined as the part of the economy that the government controls.

The public sector is the part that nobody controls.

That is what Bill C-48 is delivering us into. Just look at the terrible national tragedies of the nationalization of the major industries in Britain. They are national tragedies, bringing that once great country to its knees, because there is no incentive

and there is no magic left for the people in the work force and the people coming out of the universities. That is the issue.

An hon. Member: What about Maggie?

Mr. Huntington: Just look at the economic disasters of Leyland and the British Steel Corporation. The tragedy is that the British have a massive North Sea resource, and they are mismanaging their state-owned economy so badly that they will dissipate that resource before they can come out of it and protect the welfare state which is so dear to them. That is the tragedy.

I wonder why that great NDP haven and example of the perfect life for the masses—I am speaking of Sweden—has backed away from increasing state ownership, to the point now where the state owns less than 5 per cent of the economy. I wonder why. And here we are nationalizing one of the most important aspects we have in Canada. What we are dealing with in Clause 27 and Motion No. 21 is fundamental to our future and to the protection of our sense of individualism in this great land. What we are dealing with, as a bottom line, is our freedom. If we allow ourselves to become organized and structured by the state, we lose that human magic. Organization interferes with the incentive to create and be efficient, and that magic is being smothered by this clause and by this bill.

In countries which lose their economic freedom there can be no political freedom. That is the issue in this motion tonight. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is too late now for the Canadian electorate to wake up, but I ask those hon. members opposite with minds and concerns—and I know there are some—please, wake up and realize what a serious issue we are dealing with. Organization of this kind denies us the magic that is in the human soul, and it is that magic which built this country and delivered us into the sense—perhaps the false sense—of wellbeing we have today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it needs to be said, but let us get one thing very clear: I am not a socialist. I am a free enterprise person. As was pointed out by the previous speaker, I believe we have seen examples of the folly of trying to direct the economic operation of the private sector by government, by ministers, by bureaucrats and by boards. It has not worked.

An hon. Member: What about Suncor?

Mr. McCain: Yet the clause we are now considering is one which takes one of the biggest steps ever taken in any legislation of the House of Commons toward further regulation, expropriation and management of our affairs in a very important part of our economy. It is all being done with a careless lack of concern and a total lack of consideration on the part of the back benches of the government. I suppose one could say that it is in fact the government—the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the cabinet—which is doing this, but that is not the case. Some of us have been in this House long enough to know that a thoughtful presentation by backbench members of