

Energy Supplies

Mr. Speaker: Since this follows upon passage by the House of a ways and means motion, I presume that the presentation of the bill at this time is with the consent of the House. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the motion for first reading can be taken at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

ENERGY SUPPLIES EMERGENCY ACT, 1979

MEASURE TO CONSERVE STOCKS

The House resumed from Thursday, March 15, consideration of Bill C-42, to provide a means to conserve the supplies of energy 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, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, and motion No. 2 (Mr. Lawrence).

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I had not in any way anticipated taking part in this debate, but I find it necessary, having regard to the way the rights of parliament are being tramped on, to speak and to speak very definitely and clearly. I am very concerned about the way things are going here. Indeed, I will deal with this on Monday. I find it difficult to understand why within the last couple of weeks a motion I made was not referred to in *Hansard* but was deleted. It was a motion I moved, seconded by my friend, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), which now is a complete deletion from *Hansard*. If we get to the point where motions made in this House can be deleted because they do not meet with the finer sensibility of those in authority, then this parliament ceases to exist.

I am going to deal with that very clearly and definitely because what is happening here today is further evidence of the way in which parliament is being emasculated by this government. I am referring, of course, to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) in which he asks for the deletion of clause 11(4), which provides that there can be a mandatory allocation of supplies as a result of anticipated shortages, and that there can be an objection raised thereto. Then subclause (4) says:

At fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the third sitting day following the commencement of consideration of a motion of which notice was given under subsection (2), or at such earlier time as the House of Commons is ready for the question, the Speaker, shall put the question forthwith without further debate.

[Mr. Gillespie.]

What is the reason for that? Yesterday when speaking in Vancouver the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) spoke of creeps. I did not intend to speak today, but when I looked up the meaning of the word "creep", I thought that it aptly described the kind of creeping thing that is creeping into parliament so that more and more this institution is being undermined by a government that has no regard for it.

I was interested in finding the meaning of "creep". I looked it up and found that it is "nervous shrinking or shiver of dread". Certainly the way this government is postponing the calling of an election would indicate that the creeps are over there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I would ask the minister why he needs this clause and who produced it. What about the rules as they are now? I am going to refer to them. I have quite a bit of respect for this minister. He was at sea during the days of war, and he is still there in the House of Commons today.

An hon. Member: This is still a war.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not going to go into particulars of that nature. Is this clause another attempt to trample on the rights of parliament by gagging the members? What is its purpose? The government already has the power to prevent unnecessary discussion. Why does the minister want this additional power? The government has the closure method and used it during the pipeline debate. In addition the government has the guillotine rule, 75C. Why does it need another power? I have been in this House a long time and in the last few months I have seen the greatest degradation of the rights of this institution that I have seen in all those years. What does the Prime Minister think of parliament? We now have identification badges so members can show themselves as belonging to parliament. After all, we remember what he said about us, that members of parliament were so insignificant that when they got 50 feet away from the House of Commons they were nonentities and non-existent.

An hon. Member: Nobodies.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: With the aid of these wonderful badges they will at least be able to show that they are members of parliament.

Now what is this government attempting to do? Should I believe the government when it says: Of course, we just want this power, we are not going to use it? I think of the promises that have been made. During the question period I sent out to get some of the reports of promises that we have had from this government. I think of the questions this morning about inflation and rising prices. I just do not know how it came about that we have inflation, because in a speech of the Prime Minister on May 20, 1968, I find that he said:

The government is not broke, but the government—if it wants to have a sound dollar—must sustain a balanced budget.