

Energy Supplies

its moment of death can find nothing to say about energy policy. It could only condemn the opposition party which was not in the position to put forward policy and govern the nation in the past.

I will come to those points which the Minister of Energy is unable to read. We can demonstrate quite clearly what the critics, my leader, and what our spokesman have said on energy policy. One thing we will underscore this evening is that this government is in the position of a wounded animal, backed into a corner, and the only thing that it can think to do is to fight whoever is there, irrespective of where the obligation of responsibility lies.

We have an emergency crisis in this country. It is not brought about because there is no energy supply, it is brought about because there was no policy supplied. We have to ask the question: where was the minister when OPEC was formed some seven years ago? Did he just wake up in the last few days or weeks and discover that Venezuela was not exactly the most stable nation in the world? Did he just wake up and somehow find out that Saudi Arabia or Iran might not be nations we can depend on in the long term? How was it that the pipeline, encouraged by members of this party for a long time to be extended with greater capacity from Sarnia to Montreal, extending it from Montreal to Quebec City with a natural gas pipeline that would sweep the breadth of the country from sea to sea, was never heard of by the government side of the House?

And so as a member of this incredible opposition I can only say I find it more incredible that the Minister of Energy can find nothing to do, when it was his responsibility to introduce policy, but blame us for not having any policy. That, sir, shows he operates in a vacuum. There is a tingling sound when he shakes his head sideways which rings over here, and gives me a clear indication that what I am saying is valid.

The minister claims we spent three days holding down one of the amendments at report stage. He never made any mention as to the merits of the amendments; he took some other interesting positions. This is a government that dreams up emergencies and hopes to find an excuse to write legislation. While the minister is talking about a potential emergency he did not tonight, or at any time previously, demonstrate that an emergency existed. What he is talking about is a potential emergency.

What about other resources? Is this the way in which this government will write legislation? What happens then to British Columbia's forest products industry? What happens to Saskatchewan's potash industry, and what happens to Ontario and Quebec's mineral wealth, or the fisheries of the Atlantic region? All of these are potential areas of emergency, and from the government's thinking there should be an emergency bill for anything that can be a potential emergency.

Mr. Gillespie: You mean wait for the House to burn down before calling the fire department?

Mr. Malone: That is right. We will wait until the House is burned down. This House could burn down—

[Mr. Malone.]

Mr. Jarvis: Your house has been burned for ten years.

Mr. Malone: There is no danger of this House burning down, the minister could not get up enough heat to do that.

The minister has faulted us for using up the time of the House, claiming this afternoon in his usual spokesman-like way, that we were the party that throughout report stage held up the measure. I took a look at that during the lunch break. Here is the data.

● (2030)

Mr. Gillespie: Where is it?

Mr. Malone: If the minister can control his energy, the data is coming. Here is the data. I do not mind taking the time to give this to the House. Conservative members spoke 29 times. The other parties combined spoke 24 times, 75 per cent by the Liberal party. If the situation was such that there was no need to talk, that there was concern about a filibuster, and if the bill was so good, how come 75 per cent of all the time used by those other than members of this party was used by members of the government party? Certainly they have to address themselves to who is doing the filibustering.

As members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, surely it is our obligation to do an analysis and a critique in order to try to make better legislation. If it is not an obligation, then I ask the next question. What is this government up to now that it is somehow trying to change the whole format of parliament so that we cannot give analyses or critiques? Surely the minister knows this. If we look at this bill and analyse it in terms of other major pieces of legislation, it has not taken up as much time as most other major pieces of legislation that have come before this House.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said that the opposition claims the government is seeking too much power. That is not just our position. There are members on the government side who make the same claim. They say that this bill seeks too much power. In fact there are members of the cabinet who are on record as saying the same thing.

Mr. Gillespie: Who? Name them.

Mr. Malone: I am asked to name these people on the government side and in the cabinet who say the government is seeking too much power. I do not mind responding, because we had passed in this House in January, 1974, an almost identical bill with virtually no changes except for a few clauses that were not substantive. I would like to share with members opposite what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) had to say about the legislation being put forward at that time. What the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources does not wish to do now is listen, after having asked me to name them. Here is what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said about the legislation:

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

Mr. DRURY: Price and wage control?