

Petroleum Administration Act

rule that the tradition be changed so that we can use the proper names for members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: I am prepared to abide by Your Honour's ruling either way.

Mr. Collenette: Mr. Speaker, I would like to substantiate the comments you have just made. We do have rules. The hon. member may have some arguments as to why the rules of the House should be changed. However, this is not the time or the place for such a debate. We are debating the Petroleum Administration Act. Perhaps we can take the hon. member's concerns under advisement.

There is a procedural committee of this House. There has been talk by many members regarding parliamentary reform, such as limiting speeches. The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) objected last Friday afternoon to the reading of speeches in the House during private members' hour. These may very well be legitimate concerns, but the rules of the House are there to be observed and obeyed. I hope we do not debate this matter now.

Mr. Waddell: Perhaps I can aid you, Mr. Speaker, I agree.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): We can dispose of the matter. The parliamentary secretary is quite correct, this is not the time. Under our rules, we are not in the position to debate it now. The hon. member has pointed out that in the case of some members, this may be something the House would like to go to eventually. This having been said, we better stay with what we have now and what we have is a requirement that hon. members refer to one another by their constituencies.

Mr. Waddell: Rome was not built in a day. I was dealing with some of the speeches I heard in this House. In particular, I listened to the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae). I will not mention his name. He sits opposite. He expressed the view which I have heard many Liberals express during this debate, namely, that the Liberals are fortunate that they are in the middle. Suddenly they are fine, things are fine, and the policy is right because they are in the middle.

I wish the hon. member were in his seat today. I am sure the parliamentary secretary will relay my message that that is the muddle middle. In modern politics, which is something else that is coming out of the west, the muddle middle is gone. People want parties to take a position today. They want them to define their positions. I see the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan). He is in the muddle middle about the marijuana issue. I do not know how long he will get away with that. I do not think it will be much longer. That is the kind of new politics we will see coming out of the west.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan also suggested that provinces such as Newfoundland cannot protect themselves from the large multinationals and, therefore, the federal government must do that. I again point out to him that British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Quebec in their relationships

vis-à-vis the multinational oil companies have a much better record than the federal government.

One problem with western alienation is that all the really exciting action, with the exception of the bilingualism legislation, since the sixties has happened in the provinces. There has been nothing from the federal government. The hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan further suggested that we in the New Democratic Party should be in favour of this policy because we, above all parties, believe in the strongest of strong central governments. Speaking for myself, I would like to see my party, and I hope it will, move this way.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question.

Mr. Waddell: I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker, at the end of my speech.

Mr. Oberle: You call that a speech?

Mr. Waddell: I am saying that the people of this country want the power moved closer to the people, which is the provinces, or even to the local level. When the New Democratic Party formed the government in British Columbia, they established community resource boards which brought the government and the welfare system right down to the local people. That is the future in politics. In any event, I want to talk a little about the gas policy while we are dealing with it under this part of the motion.

An hon. Member: Good. We have been exposed to your gas all afternoon.

Mr. Waddell: We have been exposed to your gas policy and your oil policy. The problem with the oil policy is that it sold our oil at cheap prices. We in the NDP are worried that the same might be done with natural gas. Yesterday a report came out from the Canadian Institute for Economic Policy. The author of the report, Bruce F. Willson, had this to say at page 93:

—this country can probably expect a natural gas deficiency within five to ten years, if not sooner. Such shortages will have devastating effects.

We are now selling cheap gas. Later we will have to import expensive gas from such places as Algeria. Last spring we debated the pre-build of the Alaska pipeline. That is a microcosm compared to our other problems. American companies are now saying that the pre-build pipeline, when built, will only operate at 40 per cent capacity. The pipeline in my province of British Columbia only operates at one-half capacity.

In our scramble for gas exports, we have overbuilt our pipeline capacity. Last December the National Energy Board approved eight applications for more exports. Only half have been taken up by the Americans. Clearly they do not want our gas now.

Look at the Canadian government policy. We have this fancy energy policy. However, we must look at the reality of it and see what they have been doing. The government has been