

Oil and Petroleum

from the export charge to cushion the price of oil in eastern Canada.

Mr. Horner: What are you doing to bring about more supply in central Canada? That is the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We are dealing with what Mr. Getty appears to be professing and what hon. members are holding up in the House. Members representing the Atlantic provinces, parts of eastern Canada, as well as other parts of Canada, would be very much prejudiced if the price of our oil were forced up to world price levels. I think they should consider again whether they agree to step number four, Mr. Getty's proposal that the federal petroleum administration bill should not go through.

Item number five raises the question of a petrochemical industry being established in Ontario. I hope the hon. member for Lambton-Kent does not have the notion that the Petrosar project should not go to southwestern Ontario because—

Mr. Andre: But where are you going to get the oil? That is the point.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The notion that the federal government wants to build such a plant in Ontario first is not true. The petrochemical projects have not gone ahead in Alberta as a result of a provincial decision. The planning decision as to where to put the Dow-Dome project has been outstanding for several years. Negotiations are in process with CIL, Dow-Dome and others, but the decision on where the petrochemical industry will locate, and what it will do, is a decision for the Alberta government. It does not rest with this government. This is a matter for provincial decision, and it is unfair to suggest otherwise.

If the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona considers this bill from the standpoint of its entailing antipathy to central Canada—and I see the hon. member for Lambton-Kent is sitting in front of him—does it not strike him that his argument is a contradiction in terms? We are talking about policies which exist at present and will exist in future in order to assist all parts of Canada. Does the hon. gentleman really wish to found his policy on that kind of antipathy to the part of the country which I and others in this chamber represent? I suggest the hon. member is far too intelligent to support a policy stemming from that position and I am sure that if he considers that, he will appreciate the contradiction inherent in his argument.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Chairman, we have just witnessed a typical performance by a Liberal minister who uses divisiveness as his main weapon. He began by attempting to divide me from my Alberta colleagues, by suggesting that I am possessed of a much superior view, which he would be willing to discuss with me. Let me tell the minister that everything I have learned about oil and gas I have learned from my Alberta colleagues.

Mr. Faulkner: That is the problem.

Mr. Roche: If the minister knew as much about oil and gas as members from Alberta do, the government would be in much better shape.

[Mr. Symes.]

The minister also used the weapon of divisiveness characteristically to divide and conquer. He tried to make it look as if in some way I am opposed to central Canada because I referred to Mr. Getty's position. Let me say that Mr. Getty can speak for himself; he is perfectly capable of it. I used the words I did, in the context of the Liberal government's domination of this country from a position of central Canadian strength. That is the issue. We, in the west and the maritimes, must keep on resisting this government, so that we can develop. That development will not take place under the centralist philosophy and domination of a government run by Liberals in Ottawa.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Roche: I urge the minister to refute the charges made by Mr. Getty and myself. He has tried to make it appear as if we are opposed to the interests of central Canada. I am not opposed to the interests of central Canada, but I am opposed to our entire country being dominated by a philosophy which protects central Canada at the expense of the development of jobs and resources in western Canada as well as in the maritimes. That is the issue.

I went to the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, as did many of my colleagues, and I could quote chapter and verse what happened, but I will not take up the time of the committee. Oh, yes, the Liberals went in with a list of proposals which looked as if they were committed to the well-being of western Canada. Yet 18 months later we know what happened. The result of the conference is zero, less than zero if you consider the lifting of the rail freight freeze.

In his response the minister did not deal with the central problem, which is how we are to ensure supplies for central Canada through strengthening our resource base in the west. We want to develop those resources for the good of all Canada. That development and exploration will not take place unless our people have confidence in the government, unless the government is credible, and unless it is prepared to negotiate. My chief witness is Mr. Getty, a man of great repute in this country. He has given up on private negotiations and made a public attack. That is what the minister must respond to now.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, as this debate is to continue on Monday, tomorrow is to be devoted to the consideration of a ways and means motion connected with the budget, and as the minister wishes to propose several technical amendments which must be explained, could the minister not present those amendments now, so that members can study them over the week-end? That way we could express ourselves more cogently. Is the minister willing to accept this suggestion?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, over a week ago I provided hon. members with amendments; there are to be a number of additional amendments. I will be glad to go into them on a clause by clause basis.

Mr. Horner: The minister is filibustering his own bill.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Not at all. I want to help.