

Energy Supplies

● (1430)

Government members have attempted, during the course of this debate, to pay more attention to justifying the existence of Petro-Canada than to dealing with the central part of this legislation. Hon. members opposite must be really nervous because at every opportunity they try, in an inadequate fashion, to make a case for Petro-Canada, to make Petro-Canada the central issue, and in so doing are likening themselves to the NDP. If this had come from the corner of the House to my left, I would not be surprised, but to see government members so preoccupied with their favourite state enterprise, namely Petro-Canada, really overwhelms me.

I see present the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) who hails from the city of Sarnia. I am surprised that he and his community, which has survived and contributed to Canada through its industry and petrochemical plants without the existence of Petro-Can, has to be such an ardent supporter of this.

As I said, in taking that position they prove they are no different from the NDP. It also confirms that they believe in government ownership as the first resort rather than as the last resort. They have also demonstrated throughout this process that when they speak of ownership, what they really mean is government ownership. They believe that Canadian ownership can be best achieved through government ownership. That is the central issue here and the cut and thrust of the debate which has emanated from that side of the House.

I think, as has been pointed out, that there is no crisis here. It is a fabricated crisis, sparked by a cutback of 100,000 barrels of oil from Iran, an amount which is equal to the production of one heavy oil upgrading plant or one additional tar sands plant in this country, an amount which could be met by the availability of the shut-in surplus which is presently available in the province of Alberta if we had an adequate delivery system. But such is not the case, thanks to the inadequacy of, and lack of leadership from, this government and successive ministers of energy.

This bill was ostensibly brought in to meet an emergency situation, but what we have here is the opportunity for government members to do some flag waving in favour of their most favourite state enterprise, Petro-Can. In the course of this, they set out to mislead Canadians into believing that all is well and secure so long as Petro-Canada is here.

As I said earlier, the authoritarian powers contained in this bill are of concern to us all. What I think is of concern as well is that it puts the federal government in a position to lasso provincial energy resources, if this can be done, in a real or imaginary crisis, because the powers are so broad.

Third, the presentation of this bill at this time is, in my view, a blatantly political move. The tactics which are now being used by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and by other leading spokesmen of the Liberal party are spreading fear and division in this country as a result of this so-called energy crisis. Clearly it is not in accordance with the facts to suggest that it is not a political gesture or move. It was even suggested in an article that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lalonde) agreed with this statement:

It is a bill which the Liberals intend to flourish during the election as a substitute for the energy policy they failed to develop in the seven years since the Arab boycott.

The article continues as follows:

Justice Minister Marc Lalonde admitted as much—for the Montreal media which he perhaps thought would not penetrate to the rest of Canada—when he described it as a good election plank.

We have a government which is using energy to promote its own political advantage. That is shameful and disgusting.

An hon. Member: From what are you quoting?

Mr. Mazankowski: The quotation came from the *Globe and Mail* article entitled: "Tyrant in Ottawa". It began as follows:

The Energy Supplies Emergency Act is a bill produced by the federal government under false pretences.

Mr. Cullen: Who is the author?

Mr. Mazankowski: The article appeared in the Saturday, March 10 edition of the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. Cullen: What is the author's name?

Mr. Mazankowski: I am sorry but the article does not show the author.

An hon. Member: The *Globe and Mail* is afraid to put a name to it.

Mr. Mazankowski: Hon. members opposite quite frequently refer to the *Globe and Mail* when it is to their advantage.

An hon. Member: It is a Tory paper.

Mr. Mazankowski: I am not sure it is a Tory paper. I always thought it was a Liberal paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I think there is a clear provision in the rules of the House that when a member quotes from a newspaper he has to accept responsibility for what he is quoting. I think the traditions of the House are very clear on that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, certainly I am glad to acknowledge the point made by the hon. member. The document from which I am quoting appeared in the Saturday, March 10 edition of the *Globe and Mail*. It is entitled: "Tyrant in Ottawa." I am not sure what else the hon. member wants. Whether I am taking responsibility for it or whether the *Globe and Mail* is taking responsibility for it, when a member quotes from a newspaper article in the House he must identify simply the source. The source in this instance is the *Globe and Mail*. If Your Honour has a different ruling, certainly I will accede to it.