

Oil and Petroleum

producing provinces, even the National Energy Board. Inaction now is inexcusable.

The government is not going to solve much in the long run by bills such as this. This is a band-aid bill designed to cope with a situation that should never have arisen. I can forgive the government their past mistakes, for they were in good and abundant company, but now the message of conservation, the need to create a sustainable and stable society, is writ so large that anyone can see. The government's failure to take tough decisions now to protect our future will rightly appear to future Canadians to be incredibly callous.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes left before five o'clock I should like to make a few remarks, some of which are prompted by the contribution to the debate in this committee last Thursday by the hon. member for Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe from the Liberal side. I respect the hon. member's integrity and ability and his contribution to this House, but for some reason he went off the rails in his contribution to the debate. In *Hansard* for December 5 the hon. member is reported as saying, at page 1972:

I cannot understand why the Tory members from Ontario have not spoken on this bill . . .

I regret the hon. member's absence today because there have been and, I am sure, will continue to be many members from Ontario who will speak on the bill. Indeed, it is likely that all members from Ontario will speak, because the bill is of vital concern to that province. The hon. member also said on December 5:

I ask the Conservative members from Ontario, Quebec and the maritimes if they really understand this bill and if they truly appreciate the implications if it should not go through.

I assure the hon. gentlemen that not only do members from those provinces understand it, but they are alarmed by the implications of the bill. It seems to be his position, in a simplified sense, that if you are for this bill you are for cheap energy, and if you are not for the bill you are for expensive energy. What the hon. member failed to direct himself to is the more important problem of there being any supply of energy. If he proposes to speak for the good people of his riding and the people of Ontario, I hope he will direct his energies principally and forcibly to that single issue so important to all Canadians no matter where they live in this country, namely, what are we going to do in face of reports now available from the National Energy Board and the Economic Council of Canada? This is the first independent information available to all members of the House and to all Canadians indicating where we, as a consuming nation, are headed.

If the hon. member insists on concerning himself solely with the matter of price, I would suggest to him as forcibly as I can that he is ignoring the bush because he is swallowed up in the trees. With respect to price, the hon. member should know, as the minister certainly does, that there is ample legislation available for the government to assure the price with which he is so concerned. We went through that exercise. Today the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands made very clear just what was available to the government to solve this great preoccupation that the hon. member for Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe has with price.

[Miss MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands).]

But the matter becomes more serious than that, Mr. Chairman. For some reason the hon. member related this legislation to the productivity of agriculture. If I understood him correctly, he suggested that the potential productivity of Canadian agriculture is dependent upon this piece of legislation. He would indicate to the House that lack of increase in that productivity is directly related to the price of energy. I suggest that any increase in agricultural productivity is not related to the price of energy, but to an agricultural policy, or lack of one, such as exists in this country.

If the hon. member would like to increase the productivity of his farming constituents, I would suggest that he look to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance for salvation. We have been told over and over again by the Minister of Agriculture, in this House and elsewhere, that this country is capable of producing 50 per cent more than it does, and never once have I heard the minister or anyone speaking on his behalf or on behalf of the government suggest that we will not be able to reach this capacity because of the energy situation or the price of energy.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might call it five o'clock? I want to get into the broader aspects of this legislation, and I see about 30 seconds before the hour.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that we call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

It being five o'clock, I shall rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—External affairs—Role of Israel in deciding attendance of representatives of Palestinian Liberation Organization at Geneva conference—Position of Canada; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Social security—Reciprocal agreements on pensions with foreign countries—Possible agreement with United Kingdom and United States; the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser)—Unemployment insurance—Reason for denial of benefits to employees of British Columbia Railway—Government position.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on