

Having watched various governments in their efforts to solve the constitutional and jurisdictional difficulties in the smaller provinces, we are rather apprehensive about giving any minister, or any government, the right unilaterally to cut through constitutions and contracts in setting prices for crude oil or natural gas. That must be the fundamental objection to this proposed measure. Hopefully there will be some amendments when, and if, the bill reaches the committee.

The government must reverse its anti-industrial bias. I do not suggest that it should necessarily adopt a pro-industrial bias, but it should develop a responsible industrial bias so that we do not continue to force oil drilling crews, be they in the west or in the Atlantic provinces, to move to foreign jurisdictions. That certainly does not assist us in organizing our supply.

In closing I should like to suggest once again that the government give serious consideration to the harnessing of tidal power. We should proceed with the construction of a pipeline, and extend it past Montreal to the Atlantic provinces. That pipeline should have a reversible potential so that petroleum can flow in both directions. We must increase our funding of research and development projects. We must spend more attention and time on developing additional energy sources.

The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) might well be interested in uranium, but I suggest uranium is just a little pinch in the area of energy source when compared to the potential tidal power in Atlantic Canada. When we see how little progress there has been in ironing out many of our energy problems, one wonders how any member of this House could possibly agree to give the government additional jurisdiction to resolve these problems, particularly when one realizes that these powers will allow the government to cut through the constitution.

I wonder how those members from Quebec, that province where there is great constitutional difficulty and division as between provincial and federal governments, could go along with this bill in its present form. Surely even they will agree that there must be some changes made in committee.

I am sure there are other members who want to contribute to this debate. I hope many of these problems will be resolved when the bill gets to the committee. As I have said before, this whole matter is a little like "Alice in Wonderland". We have a Madhatter atmosphere and on we run blindly.

There are many problems in this country, and in every country of the world, that require immediate solution. I suggest that when the nations of the world get together on our food and population problems, perhaps they can get together also on our oil and gas energy problems. Maybe a solution will be found in Rome to our food and population problems, and that is to be hoped if there is to be any sanity in the world at all.

● (2130)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Business of the House

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mrs. Morin in the chair.

Mr. Sharp: Madam Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS AND PROVISIONS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill C-22, to amend the Canada Pension Plan, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, in the interest of co-operation this party is prepared to let the bill pass without any further debate. We hope this will expedite the business of the House and that due recognition of this move will be given by the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we could proceed to the consideration of Bill C-27.

Mr. McKinley: I, too, rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood it was more or less agreed this afternoon that if the House were to pass Bill C-22 that Bill C-4 would be called. I realize the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) is not here, but that was our understanding. There is an amendment at the report stage of that bill standing in the name of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall). If the House would give its consent the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles) would move the amendment on his behalf. We would be prepared to proceed in that way, rather than consider Bill C-27 at this time.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, apparently there has been some misunderstanding. I was lead to believe by a spokesman for the official opposition that there was a desire to postpone consideration of the bill until the hon. member referred to would be in the House, but we are very happy to proceed with Bill C-4 now.