

*Energy Supplies*

**Mr. Breau:** Mr. Speaker, could we hear the view of the Chair to see if it is correct that when a member quotes from a newspaper article, he has to accept responsibility for what he quotes?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Breau:** I do not have Beauchesne's in front of me, but clearly that is a tradition of the House.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I am not sure whether Your Honour will rule on this matter, and I am not sure what the hon. member is implying when he suggested that I should take responsibility for this article. It is an article which has been published widely. I think it is worthwhile repeating. I am doing that for the obvious benefit of the hon. member who perhaps may find the statement will broaden his intelligence.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am not in a position to answer the point raised by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau). I have attempted to identify some citations, but my first impression is that the point made by the hon. member is more related to an unidentified document than an identified one. The hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has identified the document. Unless I find another interpretation, the impression I have given at this time is adequate.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to table the entire article and newspaper; it could be appended to *Hansard*. It does not make much difference to me, but I think what Your Honour really said in handing down your decision is that the intervention by the hon. member for Gloucester was very silly. He should know better; he has been in the House since 1968. I am surprised at his very frivolous point of order.

Another point I should like to make flowed from the mouth of the honourable member for Gloucester last night. The bill has given members opposite an opportunity to attack the premier of the province of Alberta. That is really unjustified. The one-price system for petroleum products has been referred to by the honourable Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie). It is a system for which the government takes credit, but I should like to point out that the one-price system in effect takes away from revenues which normally would accrue to the province of Alberta. Whether we like it or not, something in the order of \$14 billion to \$15 billion has been relinquished by the citizens of Alberta as a result of the one-price system. That generous approach was referred to by the honourable member for Calgary South (Mr. Bawden) when he spoke yesterday.

It is important to recognize that this measure has been condemned by the producing and consuming provinces. The province of Ontario referred to it as a form of War Measures Act. In his attempts to divide and conquer, the Prime Minister suggested that Alberta and Ontario cannot agree on anything. But one matter which the two provinces have agreed upon is the position they take respecting this particular bill. Once again the Prime Minister is resorting to the same old tactics: divide, conquer and confrontation. The Prime Minister has

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

made a career out of his policy of confrontation, dividing and attempting to conquer. As a result Canada has been victimized by those actions. In effect, the bill gives the government an opportunity to use that device once again. It sums up the total substance of the government's energy policy over the last 11 years. This bill will further the confrontational tactics within the country. At the present time there is confrontation with the private industry and the provinces. If it was not Exxon, some other company would have been involved.

The problem is that the premiers of the provinces simply do not trust the government or the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. They did not trust the minister's predecessors either. Really that is what is wrong. Certainly spirited leadership has been lacking from the minister and the government. Through some spirited leadership I think it is possible that we could bring together the producing and consuming provinces. We would lay the groundwork for a sensible and rational method of resolving our energy problems. There seems to be a pathological envy for the resources which lie under the ground in Saskatchewan and Alberta in the minds of the government, particularly in the mind of the Prime Minister. The government is prepared to forgo Canada's ability to have a secure and adequate supply of energy because of the envy it holds for the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

The government is concerned about the growth of the heritage trust fund. I should like to tell the House something about the fund. It is being used for the benefit of Canadians and for the building of Canada. There is evidence of this in terms of the loans which have been made to other provinces and the agreement of the government of Alberta to go ahead with the development of a port facility in Prince Rupert. Also there is evidence of this in terms of the fund's leadership in the area of medical research.

I could go on and on, but I simply implore the Prime Minister not to deny Canadians an adequate and secure energy supply simply because of his envy and dislike for one province. What is wrong is that there has been a lack of leadership, policy direction and action. The reason there is an inadequacy today is the government's ineptness and incompetence. Petro-Canada will not turn the situation around.

● (1440)

If we look at a document entitled "An Energy Strategy for Canada", under the "Chronological Listing of Policy Initiatives, 1973-1976" we find for January 1974 the following:

The federal government announced a policy of an all-Canadian coast-to-coast pipeline network to develop self-reliance in oil and details of the Interprovincial Pipeline extension to Montreal.

That was the announcement back in January 1974, but we are no further ahead in the development of that Canadian coast-to-coast pipeline today that we were then, over five years ago. That quotation is from page 152 of that document, Mr. Speaker.

We know that the interprovincial pipeline connection to Montreal has been completed, but there has been a constant campaign by IPEC, starting in June 1966, with more pleas in