

announcing the oil policy. Has he forgotten that the right hon. Prime Minister then said that he wanted to make Canada one country by abolishing the Borden line, and that the policy was for oil to run at the same price throughout Canada? It is a six-year program.

**Mr. La Salle:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister. I had gathered from his speech, Mr. Speaker, just what the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine understood, and in view of the declarations of the minister in charge, that the east is far from being assured of benefitting from prices as low as those in the west. To my mind, the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine should study the consequences of this bill, because it does not do much to guarantee equal prices. I am very happy the question was put to me: it gives me a chance to tell the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine that I am willing to co-operate with him so that all Quebec members insist that the minister set the same prices for the east, and specially for Quebec.

**Mr. Béchard:** Does the hon. member for Joliette know that there is—

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. If this is the last question, I will allow the last reply.

[Translation]

**Mr. Béchard:** Could I ask a question to the hon. member for Joliette, Mr. Speaker?

I heard the comments that the hon. member just made, but is he aware that there is no pipeline yet between Sarnia and Montreal? Is he aware of that? And does he know that until there is, we shall have to get oil from somewhere?

**Mr. La Salle:** I am certainly aware of it, Mr. Speaker, but is there any need to ask such a stupid question? It certainly must be a stupid question, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious.

I should like to tell him that the hon. member for Joliette is aware there is not yet any pipeline between Sarnia and Montreal and that he understands that this policy was aimed at extending the pipeline to Montreal and I said clearly in my speech that I was not against the idea. I only wanted that the province of Quebec be assured of getting a fair price. The hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine did not give me the assurance that his government would promise Quebec equal prices with the west. And this is what the Quebec population would like to learn not only from the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine, but from all other members of the province who are in majority in the government. As for the French power within the Liberal party it is time, Mr. Speaker to make maximum use of it.

[English]

**Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona):** Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some suggestion that the Conservatives are filibustering this bill. May I just point out to you that the last four speakers have been non-Conservatives. If I could put a title on my speech it would be this,

### *Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

"Don't try to turn the rest of Canada against us, Mr. Trudeau". That warning appeared in an editorial in the *Edmonton Journal* two days ago which began with the following words:

Prime Minister Trudeau's attempt to portray Albertans and Premier Lougheed as the ogres in the energy crisis is surely a cheap and barefaced cover-up. It ill becomes him.

That sums up the feelings in Alberta today about the energy debate. Something is happening in Canada today that I do not like. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is playing with national unity in order to demonstrate to Canadians that his energy policies—and only his—are saving unity; and, of course, that Alberta is looking out only for Alberta and thus hurting Canada. The Prime Minister shows signs of wanting to pit the rest of the country against Alberta so that he will have a ready-made election issue. The strategy is becoming clearer all the time, and it is in this context that we are now debating Bill C-236, the energy supplies emergency act. If it needs saying, I will vote against this bill on second reading because I am opposed to its principle.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) have given lengthy explanations of their opposition. I am in agreement with their views and add the following reasons for my opposition: the government comes to us with an act that would—

—provide a means to conserve the supplies of petroleum products within Canada during periods of national emergency caused by shortages or market disturbances affecting the national security and welfare and the economic stability of Canada—

Acknowledging that it cannot prove that an emergency exists, the government tells us that the bill is for insurance against an emergency. No wonder the hon. member for Peace River called into question the integrity of the "insurance broker". Let us not forget that the proposed energy supplies allocation board would have immense powers and that, as clause 10 makes clear, the board would act under the instructions of the government. Again, all this might be acceptable if there were a genuine national emergency. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no energy crisis in Canada. As the Prime Minister himself noted when he spoke in the debate on this subject in 1972, Canada imported 770,000 barrels a day, while at the same time exporting 950,000 barrels. During the same time we produced 1.7 million barrels of oil per day, while consuming 1.55 million barrels. Eighty per cent of that production came from Alberta.

The Alberta government has made it clear that it will not allow Canadians to suffer from an oil shortage this winter. In a policy statement on the use of Alberta energy, Premier Lougheed set security of supply for Canadians as the first of five priorities for the Alberta government. The premier said:

Eastern Canada is confronted with a possibility of shortages this winter because of action by the Arab oil states—and I want to make it clear that Albertans feel a genuine concern about this situation. We have indicated our willingness to assist in every way possible to help ease this problem. In fact, national security of supply has been an Alberta concern for many years. In 1959, and again in 1969 and again in early 1973, the Alberta government attempted to persuade the federal government that a pipeline to Montreal was and is in the national public interest. The response in the past to this suggestion has been negative. If the Montreal