

those who are interested know who is going to control, manage and own those resources, and to whom they will be accountable in the development of those resources.

For the future of the economy of British Columbia and for the protection of the cash flow of British Columbians we have to speak to this issue. I would urge members on my left to support this amendment in order to preserve the resources of British Columbia for British Columbians. As long as there is this vagueness and this vagary, we will have stagnation in that industry offshore.

The Liberal Government's position is that the central government should own those resources, take in all the revenue possible and then take what it deems to be surplus revenue and give it back to the provinces. This is the same kind of program we have for many other taxes in the country. The trouble is that the central government spills so much; the money sifts through its fingers through accounting errors. The bottom line is that the federal government makes the provinces vulnerable to the caprice of a centralist government. The centralist government determines what the payback for these resources ought to be to the provinces.

British Columbia happens to be a producing province which is in a prosperous state. Let us consider the condition of the Atlantic provinces, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, which are on the threshold of becoming have provinces even though historically they have been have-not provinces. Let us consider how much they would still suffer from the caprice of a central government determining, by the whim of Ottawa bureaucrats and a formula they would devise, what payback ought to go to those provinces after the resources have been developed. As long as this is in the control of the central government, that government will act capriciously with those provinces.

Our party has made a clear declaration of where we stand on this. The province ought to control the offshore resources in the same way as the provinces control the land resources. Saskatchewan and Alberta have land-based energy resources. Those provinces which have offshore energy resources ought to enjoy the same kind of benefits. The problem is that whenever the federal government has tried to manipulate those land-based resources, the provincial economies have been destroyed.

● (2120)

I was talking to a friend from Alberta just a few days ago. I said to him, "Things are going pretty well in your town". He said, "No, things are shut down". In this particular case it was an auditor from the revenue department who had gone out to one of the towns in Alberta where oil drilling is the chief industry and, instead of there being 60 cats operating, there was one, merely because of the manipulative power of this central government.

We in our party are convinced that a province which enjoys an ocean shoreline ought to be able to develop resources offshore in the same way provinces can develop those resources on land. However, this is not just a matter of constitutional right and interpretation; it is a matter of stewardship. It seems to me that wherever the federal government has been involved

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

in resource development, particularly on northern land, its stewardship has left much to be desired. When we were in government one hon. member opposite came to me and said, "Why are you people so intent on granting provincial status to the Yukon?" He said, "Look at all the money the Yukon brings into the federal treasury". That is the nub of it all; the federal government wants to prevent provincial status in the north; it makes money because the Yukon has a territorial government and is not operating on behalf of the territory but on behalf of the Central government. It is a matter of stewardship. As long as resources are in the command of the central government, stewardship will be left wanting.

Canadians have become convinced that the entire energy policy is not a matter of self-sufficiency or a matter of supply; it is a matter of money for the federal Treasury. The hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) pointed out this afternoon that through tax dollars the central government is the greatest beneficiary of the energy policy. The province of Ontario gets more tax dollars out of petroleum energy than the province of Alberta. That is very poor stewardship.

As a member for British Columbia I want to speak on behalf of the province of British Columbia, which has a vital interest in this particular amendment the passage of which would ensure that the province of British Columbia, as well as the provinces of the Atlantic, would maintain control of all the energy resources and mineral resources offshore in the same way it controls other resources. Should the amendment of the hon. member for St. John's East be accepted, the province of British Columbia would benefit. Incidentally, so would the federal government because the federal government would get its due in terms of tax dollars.

I trust that hon. members of the House will accept the motion of the hon. member for St. John's East, and that the provinces which enjoy maritime coastlines will be able to control their own natural resources.

**Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South):** Mr. Speaker, I too want to speak in support of this motion introduced by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). I think it is good to begin this debate at report stage on this very important motion moved by my colleague because, although it speaks directly to the question of offshore rights for the coastal provinces, it brings us directly to the larger issue of Bill C-48 and, indeed, the government's energy policies, which are directly based on the government's philosophy of management of the country's resources, and that is a philosophy which I profoundly oppose.

The hon. member for St. John's East made a distinguished contribution this afternoon when he insisted that it is the right of the coastal provinces to control their own rates of development. Indeed, as the hon. member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) told us earlier this evening, the provinces in the Atlantic area which those two members represent had ownership of their resources when they entered Canada. I represent a province, Alberta, which had to struggle to acquire that ownership long after we became part of Canada, and if today hon. members from Alberta are fighting strongly to retain