Petroleum Administration Act

If the minister thinks that everybody will be excited to get out and explore those Canadian lands, she has a surprise coming. While preparing my remarks for this afternoon I read over a number of speeches made by hon. members in this Petroleum Administration Act debate, and I wondered how many Canadians know what we are debating. It seems to me that Canadians must be truly bewildered to hear about fish, chickens, seals, muskrats, Sheik Yamani and Ronald Reagan. They must really wonder if we are at all seriously concerned about the energy issue in this country.

For those Canadians who have followed this debate, I wonder if their chief concerns might not be for their country, their jobs, and the future of their families. I wonder if they might be thinking, what is happening to my country, will I have a job and what is the future for my family? I wonder what the steelworker is thinking as the drilling rigs move south, and what the fishermen in Halifax thinks of paying an extra 14 cents per gallon for fuel to run his boat so that the government can buy up more oil companies. I wonder what the housebuilder in Calgary thinks as he watches the flood of oil field personnel and money leaving for the United States to Canadianize the American oil industry.

We have a national energy program. The reason we are debating oil and gas prices and the Petroleum Administration Act is because this government, in spite of what the minister just said, never negotiated in good faith with the producing provinces and never intended to do so. It never wanted to reach agreement; it wanted to impose its national energy program unilaterally. The national energy plan is not an energy plan at all. It is an assault on one province and one industry. It has nothing whatsoever to do with energy. This attack on one province and one industry is unprecedented in Canada's history.

This document is a disgrace to our system of government, to our way of life, and to this institution. This document is deceitful, ambiguous, full of half-truths, untruths and misfeasance. The national energy plan is not a plan to solve the energy problem Canada faces. It is founded on two concepts. The first concept is to strip control of the resources from the provinces, to emasculate an industry, and to turn that industry over to an Ottawa bureaucracy. The plan is founded on the ideology of a centrally planned economy, and the ideology that the state is paramount over individual freedom. It is a plan to implement a philosophy which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has sought passionately for so long. Here is what the Prime Minister had to say about his philosophy: "Since neither individuals themselves nor the economic system itself can remedy Canada's economic problems, we are forced, whether we like it or not, to turn to the state. In the scheme of production, private initiative and property, collective initiative and co-operative property, public initiative and nationalization are the only means in the securing of human and economic objectives. Private initiative left to itself cannot guarantee common prosperity. That must be assured through planning. It seems evident to me that the regime of free enterprise has

shown itself incapable of resolving problems posed in education, health, housing and employment."

(1500)

I would like to ask my fellow Canadians the following: how was Canada built? How was our education system built? How were our health and housing systems built? Did the government build it or did individual Canadians build it?

Much has been said recently about western Canada separation. Coming from Calgary, I am acutely aware of the feelings of frustration, despair and hostility that exist. No one who goes to Calgary today can honestly come away without feeling that deep sense of frustration and hostility. I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents expressing their fears and angers. Let me read one such letter:

Just want you to know that I cannot accept the concept of separation. Canada—from coast to coast—means too much to me.

When the Springhill, N.S. miners were trapped in their mine, I felt it personally because they were our people—Canadians. While I can say that I feel sad about the great tragedy in Italy, it doesn't touch my heart in the same way. The French Canadians have always, to our way of thinking, complained about their inequitable treatment. We, as westerners, didn't and still don't understand them, but we responded to their anguish and their submerged desire to remain within Canada. We fought two world wars to defend Canada. I (thankfully) have only one cousin buried in the Bay of Fundy from that war. My father-in-law fought in both those wars. Our grandparents grew in this country, giving us our legacy to achieve, to build.

Certainly, we've been upset by our indifferent treatment by central Canada but we've grown and prospered. I can't throw it all away because of perilous Trudeau and his despicable henchmen. I feel a kinship with my fellow Canadians in the maritimes (even though I have never taken the time or effort to visit that part of our land).

I like my friends in Ontario despite their "blinker mentality". I feel strongly that our view, our emotions and feelings, will be heard and recognized. I know that if I fight—and I will fight—it will be to keep our country one nation. I can't accept separation as the solution.

I've been so upset by the mood and feeling in Calgary, even tho' I understand it totally and believe in the grievances, that I keep bursting into tears—and I've thought about it and have come to the conclusion—I'm fighting for Canada.

Canadians, including those from the west, know that Canada is bigger than any prime minister. Canada will survive the national energy program and Canada will survive the Liberal party. Most Canadians from the west believe in their country, as I do.

My leader was accused the other day by two members of the New Democratic Party of fanning the flames of western separatism. I have attended three meetings in the last two weeks, in Winnipeg, Vancouver and Calgary, at which my leader spoke. He has steadfastly defended Canada against the interests of those who would choose to reject confederation. Those members of the New Democratic Party know full well that my leader would stand firm against any separatism option for Canada. They know the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) stands for Canadian unity above all else. Their accusations are the worst kind of political diarrhea. They are to gain headlines.

Mr. Waddell: We are not the only ones who are saying it.

Mr. Siddon: The quiet voice in the corner there. He is not the only one who is saying it.