

ernment under Bill C-236 and, third, the whole project indeed required of a Sarnia-Montreal pipeline.

Quebec must fear any unilateral application of an export tax on Alberta oil. Any hasty acceptance of such a precedent could eventually prove very detrimental to the province of Quebec in its prospective exports of resources from James Bay, Manicouagan or any other source. Furthermore, Quebec should find that the proposed board under Bill C-236 will have extraordinary powers that do not seem to be warranted and will cause them to fear the worst. Ottawa must not once again use a particular crisis to appropriate powers that neither the constitution nor the interests at stake confer to it. Finally, if the Sarnia-Montreal oil pipeline has to be built, and in our view it should be and ought to have been for a long time were it not for the unconsciousness of those who govern Canada, we must make sure while there is still time left that Quebec be truly consulted on the size and revertibility of the oil pipeline. Quebec must have a right of control over the opening and shutting of the valve. It must above all stubbornly ensure that its project, its requirement for a genuine petrochemical industry is not thus in any way spoiled, reduced or delayed.

● (2050)

As a Quebecker and a Canadian, one must not allow the Liberal federal government to keep on going so brazenly in the direction that it has itself chosen in the field of energy policy. As a Quebecker, I cannot understand the delay of the usual awakens in expressing themselves vigorously on this topic. And as a Quebecker, I cannot easily accept that Quebec members in this House think first about their partisanship or their personal interests or their survival in office rather than the real interests of their fellow citizens which should take precedence over the risk involved in an election.

As a Canadian, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sit within a party and close to a leader—though without any flower in his buttonhole—that are the only ones to date to understand fully the proposed cabinet measures.

I cannot believe that the New Democratic Party, that was formerly so fair and clear-headed, have not seen anything serious in the energy file of the government in office, unless they have seen everything, Mr. Speaker, that is to say their last hope. And perhaps it might candidly be a left-hand turn on the part of the government, and a further state towards centralization that is so dear to them.

If being in the left wing, and the New Democratic party assumes, means accepting injustice for the people of Quebec and the Maritimes, I would rather be in the right-hand wing.

If to be a Canadian, as the Liberal and NDP members claim to be, means accepting that there are two kinds of Canadians, I really prefer, and once and for all, to belong to the Progressive Conservative party.

[English]

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to take part in the debate on this motion of confidence which has been brought forth by the Conservatives. I may say it is rather

Energy

an interesting discussion that we have had here today. To begin with, the motion reads in this way:

That this House has lost confidence in the government due to its incompetent, inconsistent and vacillating energy policy which is bringing economic loss to Canada and hardship to the consuming public.

I think it would have read much better had it been worded something like this:

That this House has lost confidence in both the government and the official opposition due to their incompetent, inconsistent and vacillating energy policies which are bringing economic loss to Canada and hardship to the consuming public.

The amazing thing is that we have just heard the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Jamieson) telling us that the decisive policies which the government announced last week, and which I personally welcome, are a watershed in Canadian history. I want to point out to the minister and to the government that they needed some prodding before this watershed in Canadian history came about, and that prodding came from the NDP group in the House of Commons who have been demanding and insisting ever since this first session of the new parliament started on January 4 last that we have changes in our energy policy.

Although we have heard from four Conservative speakers this afternoon and this evening, we have heard no policy put forward by the Conservative Party. These hon. members have the gall to bring in a resolution asking for support to defeat the government, yet they are afraid to stand up and tell the House of Commons and people of Canada what they are going to do in the energy field.

The chief energy critic from Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) said, "The people should go on the Conservative's track record". Let us look at some of the aspects of this proud track record which the Conservative Party have in the field of energy. I am not going to go back too far. I am going to take you, Mr. Speaker, to an event that occurred in 1961 when the then prime minister, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), on January 17, 1961, signed with President Eisenhower the Columbia River treaty. This treaty has turned out to be the biggest sell-out in Canadian history, bar none. Is this the proud track record that these members talk about?

Our party and other people in Canada fought for a change in the Columbia River treaty. General McNaughton, who was on the International Joint Commission, pleaded with the government for a change in program and policy. But what did we get? The Columbia River is in my riding; I live in the area and know the damage that has been done. Here today, in the midst of an energy crisis, what happens? We could have had many, many times the hydroelectric power that we are getting today as the result of the short-sighted Conservative policy of those days. I say to my Liberal friends that they were not much better. When they replaced the Conservative government in the early 1960s, they went along with this sell-out and they are partly responsible for the situation. They are to a very great extent responsible for the troubles we now see along the Columbia River.