

Energy Supplies

What is involved in this bill is a reach for power, dictatorial power, power which only a real socialist would love, power which only real socialists could appreciate, power to take away freedom from the individual.

Surely you cannot have it both ways. You cannot both condemn and embrace and have the same motive in mind in both experiences. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce should stand in his place and tell us whether or not he is a part of the socialist thinking he embraces, or whether he wants to find time in the opportunity left to him between now and six o'clock tomorrow to let us know that he does not like the power which is being sought in the legislation before us. I challenge him to do so.

In case the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources should get the impression that we are alone in our condemnation of the government let me refer to another editorial, this time from the *Toronto Sun*—I am deliberately picking eastern newspapers because it is important to note that the papers in central Canada are not of the opinion the minister would have us believe they are. I quote from the *Sun* of Tuesday, March 13:

In negotiations with the provinces, Trudeau has never been able to 'con' the premiers out of control of their energy resources. After all they are guaranteed by the BNA Act. It is one thing Trudeau would change if he got his hands on the constitution.

Well, this bill looks like the first hint of the direction we are going to take. An hon. member asks for the source. Well, the source was just given.

An hon. Member: Aren't you the expert?

Mr. Malone: For the benefit of the hon. member who interrupted I would like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I consider him to be an expert as long as we can use a definition from mathematics—an "X" is an unknown and a spurt is a drip under pressure.

I should like to turn to some of the comments made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. He said the opposition would have left the country exposed without the power to handle an emergency. The truth of the matter is that he has not been listening to our party's policy. Moreover, even if that were the case, surely the first thing which must come to mind is the question: where has the government been while the situation was developing? How did it happen that a country like ours, which has all the energy resources it needs, should be called upon to deal with an energy emergency bill such as the one before us? The truth is that members opposite have been fast asleep making Rip Van Winkle look as though he just took a nap.

The minister made another comment. He said our leader had not addressed himself to the question of energy. If that is the case, how is it that a headline in the *Montreal Gazette* says: "Clark's New Energy Plan Means Self-Reliance"? The article goes on to outline five points made in a speech by my leader in Montreal calling, among other things, for an immediate increase in capacity from Sarnia to Montreal. Did we hear today in the minister's speech anything about a bigger pipeline from Sarnia to Montreal? No, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentle-

[Mr. Malone.]

man took 40 minutes telling us there might be a crisis. He did not spend any time telling us what we might be able to do about it.

There was another point my leader made. He said he would extend the gas pipeline from Montreal to Quebec City. Did the minister say anything about that? No. He said there might be a crisis down the road.

My leader further said he would explore and exploit further sources of energy, such as oil sands, and rely on other forms of renewable energy. But the minister did not say anything about that. He just said there could be a crisis somewhere down the road and he wanted power to handle it in case what might happen did happen. Mr. Speaker, as long as they never do anything, as long as they just talk about what might happen, what might happen will happen, and as long as this government is in power that is the only reason for the bill before us. The non-doers bring about what is likely to happen.

An hon. Member: How are you going to vote?

Mr. Malone: We are going to vote for the fact that this government happens to be there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: In other words, this ought to be called a Liberal emergency creation bill. That is the only reason it is here.

An hon. Member: Yet you are going to vote for it.

Mr. Malone: The minister said all the critics condemned our opposition. Well, here is an interesting comment. The first reaction from the oil companies has been very favourable. The press has commented favourably. The oil companies are favourable. So it seems only the government was born with lead in the soles of its shoes.

Just so that the minister does not go unchallenged I will draw attention to various aspects of the Progressive Conservative policy on energy—I will just read the headings, without going into the substantive text.

● (2050)

Mr. Gillespie: Tell us about pricing.

Mr. Malone: The minister would like to hear about pricing. I will answer him directly. Yes, we should have some.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Malone: Now that the laughter has subsided, I want to speak as an Albertan and tell the House that it was only four years ago that the government drove more than one-third of the private Canadian-owned oil companies out of my province and into Montana and other places. Hon. members opposite talk about prices, but they made 22 flip-flops in terms of oil policy, and independent Canadian companies said they could not stand the frustration any longer and left Canada. What is the hollow echo from the Minister of Energy, Mines and