

place to protect the industry of central Canada in order that it might thrive because the economies of scale are just non-existent in Canada. Nevertheless, those same tariffs have increased the price to the consumer by an average of 30 per cent.

Hon. members will remember that several years ago this government put a quota system on the shoe and textile industries so that those retailers in Canada would have to buy Canadian products first. But those same industries could not supply goods to western Canada. It meant that shoe stores in British Columbia went out of business because of a policy designed to support industry in central Canada. We do not quarrel with this but it drove businesses into bankruptcy in western Canada. I ask members opposite; where is the concept of sharing when it comes to the quota and the tariff system in Canada? I say flat out to members opposite that sharing is not sharing if it is compulsory.

● (2030)

When the Prime Minister talks about sharing and then imposes a budget which forces the provinces to sell their product at below world prices, that is not sharing. That is the work of a stick-up artist of the highest calibre. When Alberta lends to other provinces at favourable interest rates or when it agrees to build port facilities in Prince Rupert, that is sharing. When Alberta sells energy at half the world market price when it could just as easily transport that petroleum to the port of Vancouver and ship it overseas to be sold at the world price, that is sharing.

On the other hand, the energy which Quebec Hydro purchases from the province of Alberta is used to generate electricity in the province of Quebec, which then sells that electricity at the world price to the United States. Is that sharing? The budget introduced by the Minister of Finance has put further strains on confederation. The hon. member for Moncton just said that westerners are reasonable people, and I agree. We have been reasonable for 100 years in the face of some very unreasonable demands. The time has come to ask ourselves how long we ought to be reasonable, how long we should pay 30 per cent more for the products and the privilege of buying Canadian while at the same time we receive 50 per cent less for our raw resources for the privilege of being Canadian.

How long should we pay higher freight rates to send raw materials east so that the products can be manufactured there and so that we can buy them back again? Yes, westerners are reasonable. If it were turned around and easterners moved west for one year, they would see how long they could be reasonable living out west. The hon. member for Moncton over the dinner hour graciously sent everybody a copy of his "Householder." I found on pages six and seven a short constitutional dictionary. It is somewhat more convoluted than Webster's. In fact, the definitions are a series of questions. There is a whole paragraph written to define the amending formula, but it never defines the amending formula. I wonder what his constituents will say six months from now when they find out that New Brunswick has been snookered out of an

The Budget—Mr. Friesen

equal share in confederation and been made a second-class province by the amending formula imposed by the Prime Minister.

The people of the west know that the Prime Minister believes that the western provinces are second-class provinces. We found that out. We have also found out how much the New Democratic Party sold out in the famous deal. I notice that members from the House of Commons have been appointed to the joint committee and that there are two members of the New Democratic Party on that committee. The people of British Columbia sent more members of the New Democratic Party to Ottawa than any other province, 12 members, yet there is not one New Democratic member on that committee from British Columbia.

The great New Democratic Party has dealt the people of British Columbia out. I can understand why they did not send the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson); it is because they cannot trust him to vote the way the leader wants him to vote. I can understand why the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) insisted that he be a member of that committee. Of course, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is a member of the committee because he is the party critic on federal-provincial relations. I suppose the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will sit next to the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville to instruct him to say the right things and to vote the right way when it comes to the constitutional proposal, particularly section 42.

Why is it there are no members of the NDP party from British Columbia on that committee? Does British Columbia not count? The master for western Canada, the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent), arranged with the Prime Minister to make sure that resources were permanently entrenched in the charter of rights in the constitution, but he could not arrange for a member of his party from British Columbia to be on that committee. That really shows his interest in western Canada.

I have followed the debate on the constitution very carefully. In fact, until closure was invoked, in my estimation, it achieved probably the highest level of debate I have ever heard in this House. Two weeks ago we struck a new low. I can recall very clearly sitting here listening to the speech of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) who was giving a very emotional and impassioned description of the problems we face in western Canada and Newfoundland with regard to separation. And what did he receive that night? He received one of the loudest guffaws from members opposite I have ever heard in this House. I remember the hon. members for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaiel), Champlain (Mr. Veillette), and another hon. member, among others, laughing.

I said to myself that night that the problem of confederation is not a problem of sharing. I recalled the concern which members opposite felt for the referendum debate in the province of Quebec. We all shared that concern. Party leaders were pairing wherever possible so that members of government could campaign for the No forces. We passed a unanimous resolution in this House urging Quebec to stay in confedera-