

Natural Resources

According to this morning's paper, the president of Occidental said that if they go ahead they want concessions on taxes and royalties, and also they would be quite willing to let the two provincial governments and Petro-Can put up the major part of the money to build a tertiary recovery plant, but of course they insist on retaining the acreage and control of the feed stock. Anyone silly enough to put up extraction facilities and leave the oil supplies in the hands of a company over which he has no control, certainly would be buying a pig in a poke.

Mr. Bawden: What about Saskatchewan?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I cannot answer all the hon. member's questions because my time is limited.

Mr. Bawden: Well, you were the premier.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Today first reading was given to a bill dealing with our Constitution. The House, and particularly the government, must realize that people are not made great by a constitution. It is the people who make a constitution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It is the people who make a nation great.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) did not start until 3.13, and he has until 3.43.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In closing, what makes a nation great is not just its constitution. A constitution is an attempt to put into legal form the hopes, aspirations, and objectives of free people. A nation only becomes great when that nation has a sense of pride and purpose. It cannot have that if its resources are to be owned outside its own borders, and if it is to have no voice whatsoever in the determination of its own economic destiny.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Canadian historian, Frank Underhill, whom many of us remember with admiration and affection, once said that a nation is a collection of people who have done great things together in the past and who are determined to do great things together in the future. Canadians have done great things in the

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

past. There is a long litany of accomplishments in peace and in war of which we can be proud. Nothing would do more to galvanize Canadians and make us a great nation than to have a sense of purpose in respect of developing our own resources, to do it with our own money and our own effort, and to be the arbiters of our own destiny. In order to do those things we need courageous leadership, and an opportunity to develop our resources. Neither the leadership nor the opportunity has been given to us by the government. If the government and the House fail to deal courageously with this problem, then we and those who come after us will have to pay the price of our inertia and apathy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, hon. members present will be glad to know that I do not intend to take up my full allotment of time in respect of this matter, simply because we do not think there is enough merit in the concept indicated by the New Democratic motion today to take up too much of the time of the House. This is not to say that we disagree with everything in the motion by any means, nor do we disagree with all the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

In this House, in the political field of this country, and as far as public opinion is concerned, nationalistic sentiment is not solely the prerogative of the New Democratic Party, the Liberal party or the Progressive Conservative party by any means. Certainly, for one, I agree it is long past due when Canada's national resources should be developed by and for the Canadian national interest. But in many respects we certainly do not agree with the nationalistic sentiments expressed by the hon. member who was the mover of the motion and who has just sat down.

● (1542)

Contrary, however, to the merits of his argument, and contrary to the main thrust of the socialistic dogma to which he adheres, and from which, unfortunately, there is no difference in concept, principle or policy on the part of the federal Liberal government of the day, we emphatically do not believe, as the hon. member just indicated, that there are only two choices or two alternatives.

That hon. member said there are only two alternatives. One of those alternatives, in his mind, obviously is the continued domination of the Canadian oil industry by foreigners, and perhaps even a consolidation through the offer or the bid by the Occidental Oil Company of California to take over Husky Oil of Canada. That is the one choice the hon. member graphically describes for us. That is not his choice, that is not my choice, and it is not our party's choice.

The other alternative he presented to the House and the public, however, as the only way Canadian resources can be preserved for Canadian use and, in the long term, for the Canadian national interest, is to have a Canadian federal governmental agency take it over.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!