

past or about the future. For in the ongoing progression of technical and industrial discoveries, mankind is destined to achieve an ever easier and more satisfying way of life. I think this attitude has caused us to consider former energy sources as obsolescent and unneeded, and has also closed our eyes to the need for new sources and types of energy for the future. We are now awakening to the fact that the supply of fossil fuels is not inexhaustible. If we are to continue to enjoy an adequate energy supply for the future, it must be through wise and all-inclusive use of all resources presently known, with research into sources which are at the moment just bursting into view or are yet beyond the horizon.

The world energy problem is not caused by a shortage of energy resources at this moment, but rather by political power plays in an endeavour to achieve national objectives. While the right to such action cannot be contested, I suggest that from the moral and ethical point of view it is neither humanitarian nor excusable. The Shah of Iran is reported to have told the Arab world: "Oil is like bread. You cannot cut it off during a time of peace. Why do you want to look as if you want the world to starve?"

As has been stated many times, the current unease in Canada is not over the question of over-all supply. My colleague from Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) last evening presented the picture quite clearly when he referred to the vast supplies of energy that we have in Canada. I should like to refer to his remarks at page 8584 of *Hansard*. He referred to the 500 billion barrels of oil, the 700 trillion cubic feet of gas, the 100 billion tons of coal, the one million tons of uranium, the hydro possibilities, the potential of the Fundy tides, the Churchill River, coal in Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and the Maritimes, and went on to say:

—we have sufficient energy sources of the non-renewable sort to last this country for 500 years or more.

So, again I say that the current unease in Canada is not over the question of over-all supply, but rather the production and transportation of this supply to all areas of the nation in volumes adequate to meet consumer requirements.

In this connection we have before us Bill C-236. I should like to associate myself with a statement made by my colleague from York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). Last Thursday, speaking prior to the speech of the Prime Minister, the hon. member had this to say, as reported at page 8477 of *Hansard*:

I hope the Prime Minister will attempt to indicate to us what case they have for stating that there may be an energy crisis in Canada this winter and for their belief that this crisis warrants the wide powers which the government wants under Bill C-236.

My colleague's hopes were not realized, for the Prime Minister sidestepped the issue completely. He did not explain the nature or the extent of whatever crisis might exist. In fact, as I indicated earlier, he stated outright that no Canadians will face shortages this winter.

I believe that Bill C-236 is another intrusion into business. This government, above all, has not indicated any overwhelming proof that it has the capacity properly to administer anything. Private enterprise has done a magnificent job of developing this nation, and if there is fault to be found, and if there have been areas in which that

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

development has failed to benefit Canadians as a whole, it is because government has failed to create the proper climate and to lay down proper legislative guidelines to achieve the highest good for the nation. I do not think that we can place the blame on private enterprise.

There may be notable exceptions, but in the majority of instances government enterprise has shown up rather poorly against the combined and experienced expertise of those engaged in private enterprise activities. It has not been government bureaucracy that has provided the impetus, the initiative and momentum that have propelled us forward in the various fields of scientific research and technological development; rather it has been those individuals with initiative and determination that have blazed the trail and opened up new vistas.

Not only do I suggest that Bill C-236 is an unwarranted intrusion into business; it is also an intrusion into the provincial domain. May I suggest that this government is a government of confrontation. It is obvious that the administration is attempting to tell the people of Alberta something. Since the Liberals do not have one single member from that province, they feel they can say whatever they want or do whatever they want. It seems to me that in a sense this is blackmail. The government is, in essence, saying "You did not return any of our members so now you will pay for it". How else can we explain the politics of confrontation in which the Prime Minister and the energy minister have dabbled during the last two to three months?

The government has been guilty of a lack of consultation with Alberta, of breaking agreements, albeit verbal agreements. Now, during the last weekend we find it engaging in slander. Let me ask how the government can justify the kind of speech that its leader made in Vancouver on Friday night. No one can tell me that he had national unity at heart when he slandered a provincial premier in the way he slandered Mr. Lougheed. This is completely unacceptable behaviour for someone who occupies the position of Prime Minister of this nation. I ask, where now is the great champion of federalism? Where now is the great champion of participatory democracy? Where now is the great champion of national unity?

Then we see the lesser of the two coalition government leaders standing up in this chamber last week and involving himself in the game of name calling, calling the Premier of Alberta "Sheik Lougheed". He forgets all the while, as I have mentioned before, that the Premier of British Columbia has increased the price of natural gas by 81 per cent. Perhaps he should be called Sheik Barrett, as the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) so rightly points out.

● (1620)

As for the view that we can blame the NDP for forcing its policies on a reluctant Liberal government, as stated by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), this is difficult to accept. I believe the NDP has lost too much credibility across this country to have such great power on this government which sits opposite at the present time. I think, as stated in an article by Mr. Charles Lynch, that perhaps there is something more important behind the position taken by the Liberal government in this connec-