

I stood up in this House and asked the hon. member from Richmond, who is chattering away here, why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) does not deny the remarks made about a western parliament by the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). Incidentally, the Leader of the Opposition heard this. That is no way to deal with the problems in western Canada. In fact, that is a negative way of dealing with them. The Conservative party has been negative in dealing with this problem. I suggest that instead of talking about separatism, the Conservative party should do something positive about the grievances of western Canada.

Many members from this part of the House come from western Canada. I can tell the member what we have been doing. We have been standing up in this House and asking for a federal-provincial development fund. We have stated that we do not like the fund outlined in the budget. It is patronage and we do not want any more of that. We do not want any more in money, such as the \$4 million going to Mr. Axworthy and some Ottawa people. We say, get the provinces involved and co-operate with us in the west. That is what we want.

Second, we supported the government and, indeed, pushed the government, telling them we wanted more public ownership of the oil industry. It took guts to say it because that is a national policy. But the people of western Canada will support that stand. I tell hon. members to take a look at those polls.

Third, instead of saying who was in bed with whom, we have taken the stand in the constitution committee that the constitution will go through, although we disagree with a unilateral move. We have decided that we will fix up the bill of rights, we will fight for women, the native people, and we will get a better amendment. Not only that, we will get an amendment which will nail down the control of the provincial governments and give them power over resource revenues. That is very important to my province. I am proud to go before that committee to stick up for that kind of result for the west. That is what my friends in the Conservative party should be doing. They should be working positively to keep Canada together.

In the event the Liberals across the way are thinking they are going to get off lightly, I shall now return to some remarks made by the minister.

An hon. Member: You are partisan.

Mr. Waddell: My friend says I am partisan. Yes, I am partisan. I am partisan for western Canada and for my province. It is about time that he got partisan, too. But let me refer to remarks made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). He had this to say: "I think it is time the members of the House, and Canadians in general, grew up with respect to the role of Canada in international affairs." The minister is not here today, but his parliamentary secretary is. He is the man with the bow tie, although he does not have it on today. I ask him to relay what I am going to say to the minister. Canadians have grown up in their attitude to foreign affairs. Canadians are proud of the role Canada plays when it gets back to its proper and active role in foreign affairs. Canadians do not need lectures from the minister

Petroleum Administration Act

telling them to grow up in their attitude to international affairs. I suggested the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should not have gone to Saudi Arabia. Instead, he should have been here dealing with the serious problem of Alberta. The minister can disagree with me and tell me that he has important things to do. That is fine, but it is my position that he should have been here and that he was remiss in running away. If he were doing something when he was away, that would be a different matter. But yesterday in the House, he did not know anything about Arabian oil. He said very little about North-South relations, although I am sure he knows a lot about it. Why did he go away? In my opinion, one should not go away when the government is losing control of a situation. The country is slipping into a crisis and the Prime Minister should be around to deal with it. He cancelled trips and stayed around during the Quebec referendum. In many ways, the situation facing us now could become a serious crisis.

The minister said he had to bring in the Petroleum Administration Act and that he had no other choice. I have already gone over my position in that connection. I said he could have negotiated; he was not obliged to do what he did. For some years there has been a tendency in the Liberal party to use a sledge hammer to kill flies. The War Measures Act was a good example. The government should be very careful in picking a fight with Alberta and in trying to bring Alberta to its knees because it could bring the country to its knees as well.

I want to refer now to remarks made by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), who is the Conservative energy critic. He claims to be concerned about the impact of this program on the average man and woman. I thought it was a joke for a moment that the Conservatives are so concerned after bringing in a budget which was going to raise prices of oil and gas even more and give a large chunk of money to the oil companies. They made what I call "the Harvie Andre deal". If you read Jeffrey Simpson's new book on the Clark government, you can see that.

● (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I apologize for interrupting the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. I wonder when the day will come when hon. members will choose to refer to each other in a more comfortable fashion than by name. For the fourth time the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway has referred to individual members by name. I know there is no slighting intention in doing that. However, I am forced to uphold the traditional rule that members should be referred to by their constituencies and I would appreciate it if the hon. member would do that.

Mr. Waddell: I was referring to the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) in terms of title which may be distinguished from referring to his name per se. I would ask Your Honour to rule right now. We are in the modern world. We have television in this House of Commons. People think we are silly when we refer to the hon. member for blah-blah-blah rather than use that member's name. I invite Your Honour to