

Resources (Mr. Lalonde) is proposing. He is simply proposing that from now on, we may Canadianize to a greater degree and even reach energy self-sufficiency with what we already have. To that end, through a most detailed and specific legislation, he is proposing that Parliament take a direct involvement in Canada lands. It is my basic impression that such a proposal deserves united, enthusiastic acceptance from Canadians, because what this is all about is truly a heritage, and the development of that heritage to the benefit of all. And what I mean by that is that this is just as beneficial for French, English and native Canadians, because the term "Canada lands" includes, of course, the Territories and the Amerindian lands. And the pooling concept means in the first place that those groups agreed to be part of the Canadian whole and that provinces also agree to take part in that pooling.

In the course of our discussions here or in committee, we often forget that reality, and in our own provinces or areas we say we have been short-changed, we do not get our share. Provinces like Alberta that were comparatively poor at first, now are in a favourable position and get ahead of the other regions. The same goes for Newfoundland. When Newfoundland accepted to join Confederation, after two referendums, other Canadians paid its way in. So much the better if Newfoundland can now strengthen its economy, but it should not be forgotten that Newfoundland is part of the Canadian whole just as any other province. It becomes very tiresome for young Canadians to note that our proceedings are strictly based on the past. When I mentioned the natural resources of 1867, I explained a while ago that they merely consisted in the navigable waters, furs, timber and fisheries, and now that we are speaking of an essential product called oil, it has become an instrument of blackmail.

Now Bill C-48 provides, of course, that the distribution of resources be planned and requires also that the provinces should not resort to blackmail with respect to any of those resources. I hope that the members opposite will give us later an answer on that point. Is it possible to build Canada while giving more energetic power to the provinces without taking all Canadians into account? What would you say of a country such as Canada where a province would become filthy rich at the expense of the other citizens of the country. It is not normal, and such is not the purpose of a government, but rather to redistribute wealth, to give freedom and to promote the movement of goods.

If there is no agreement on that principle, then I understand that hon. members opposite might not share the philosophy of this government. And in this respect I think that the party to which I belong has made its position extremely clear in the last election because that was precisely one of the issues, namely to achieve a greater Canadianization and sharing of our natural resources. We could have entered into legal technicalities and undertake a point by point study of what is proposed in Bill C-48, but what would be the use of it if at first there is no will

to live together and to share the profits as well as the deficits, the joys as well as the hardships of belonging to the same country?

When travelling around the country, we see people look so sullen. Do you know why? It is often due to the fact that our leaders by artificial means are fostering conflicts within the people. Once a conflict opposes two provinces, the federal government is being asked to take sides in the decisions to be made as is the case of the energy corridor requested by the province of Newfoundland that would go through Quebec. I could mention many such examples where the federal government was asked to be the referee when various parties are engaged in a litigation. I suggest we often forget that we have been sent here to promote greater unity among the Canadian people and although I do not expect you to fully agree on what a government can do but in this case it is quite obvious that it is a matter of sharing a resource and the benefits derived from it. This to me seems quite clear and I cannot understand why members of Parliament should be reluctant to pass such a bill. It is clearly spelled out in the bill that we are dealing with Canada lands. The purpose of this bill is not to deprive the Canadian people of their revenue but on the contrary to increase it. This is the philosophy underlying this bill, and that is what hon. members opposite have a tendency to forget.

I would like it very much if the opposition could reply to that in a few minutes. What is the argument in favour of the fact that such an important energy resource ought to be given to one province or another without Canadians as a whole being able to benefit from it? I would like to have evidence that a country can be built on economic disparity, on unfair distribution of wealth. I hope someone will give us that evidence in a few minutes. And when we go here and there, if we read the newspapers about what is happening in England, what is going on almost everywhere in the world? The problem stems from a shortage of wealth, a lack of sharing, and here we have the impression—I would even say that sometimes I have the conviction—that what we are trying to do is to widen the gap with respect to sharing and redistribution. As we are debating this bill, instead of looking strictly at the financial aspect of the operation as far as one province is concerned, we should put more emphasis on the spirit which ought to unite all Canadian men and women and try to find a formula or a prescription whereby Canadians might take pride in their own energy resources.

I think that even the former prime minister of Canada, the Hon. Joe Clark, would agree that Canada is one of the few countries that can claim to have enough resources to be completely self-sufficient in energy within 10 years. The big challenges for us to take up are to be able to control our own potential, to develop it, to make it much more economic and to use it as an extraordinary leverage. All Canadians and particularly parliamentarians should bear in mind that we govern one country and not 12 countries. I think we have a very important