

real emergency. That, really, is what we are considering, and in that regard the provision before us represents a step forward. But, in giving the non-elected, unrepresentative members of the other place the power to intervene and say, "We say, from our limited point of view, that there is no emergency, and therefore the will of the people of Canada can be frustrated by our determination," we are taking not one step forward but two steps backward.

We are talking, simply, about a matter of principle. This has nothing to do with what went on in committee. I submit that the other place is not the appropriate body to determine this particular subject matter, important as it is to all the people of Canada. The Senate does not have the power under the constitution. Why should we give them that power by statute? It would be wrong of us to do so. I think we should be abandoning our responsibilities as elected representatives if we were to share our responsibility with a non-elective body and give them power to veto decisions which are the subject matter of this particular motion. We are not considering a statute. This is to be a resolution. I think it is perfectly appropriate for resolutions to be passed by the House of Commons, without reference to the other place.

For these reasons, I hope the House will determine to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Let us pass the measure, and vest the ample power to check decisions in this elected House of Parliament; let us not resort to the other place which, for reasons I could elaborate on at length, is made up of the most inappropriate group possible to which this power should be given.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Harney). I beg your pardon. The Chair had recognized the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), but I think he had yielded to the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr.

*Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

Brewin). I think, to be correct, the Chair had better recognize the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

**Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize some of the points raised by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The amendment proposed by the minister, as printed on the order paper, is mostly the result of negotiation between the minister and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). As the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) pointed out in committee, they were busy working out last minute details. The amendment was never presented in written form in the committee. The committee agreed that it should be printed on the order paper for consideration at the report stage. This we are now doing and, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, we now see its weakness.

As the amendment proposed by the minister now stands, the Senate has the right to veto the decision of the elected members of this House. By giving that right to an appointed body we should be thwarting one of the basic principles of democracy. I am disappointed to note that members of the Conservative party so far have been supporting the amendment proposed by the minister.

If there is an emergency involving oil supplies, an emergency affecting thousands of Canadians, people in hospitals, children in schools and workers in industry, the responsibility for decision making should not rest with those who cannot speak for the people, but should rest with those who are elected in this chamber.

**Mr. Paproski:** Filibuster.

**Mr. Symes:** If the House accepts this amendment, appointed members and not representatives in this chamber will have the power to make the decision. May I call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.