

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

Mr. Haliburton: We have a policy, do not worry about that. That lost opportunity for the Mackenzie Valley pipeline will have very long-range ramifications. It may mean that the gas will stay on the northern slopes of the northern territories forever. After all, alternative sources of energy must be found, and unless steps are taken at the right time that petroleum will remain too expensive until it becomes outmoded.

What else has the government done? We had the nebulous promise of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) last week that a national petroleum company will be formulated with a capitalization of \$50 million. That is not an impressive figure, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister announced a proposed expenditure of \$40 million for research into the development of the tar sands over the next five years. The Alberta government is already committed to developing the tar sands and Syncrude is committed in respect of production. The only real cloud on the picture was whether federal tax measures would permit the project to become viable. Over the next five years the proposed expenditure of \$40 million will obviously be of some help. I suppose you might call it pocket money, in the context of the amount of money involved in the project. It is a little like carrying a toothpick to a baseball match and thinking you are going to hit the ball, or going into battle with a popgun.

In energy matters, this government should be thinking beyond traditional sources of energy. It should be looking at the needs for the next 25 years and beyond, when it appears that petroleum supplies will be rapidly running out. We should be thinking beyond nuclear sources of energy to some other types of energy being developed in other countries. But in the meantime it is essential that we have access to petroleum.

An article appeared in yesterday's *Globe and Mail* which took my fancy, Mr. Speaker. It seemed to indicate that Canada has missed the boat on international trade in oil. The headline was "French group to build steel plant in Iraq". Apparently, under a contract between France and the government of Iraq, the French government has agreed to provide what is called technical aid in exchange for being exempted from the Arab oil embargo and, in addition, to have a two-year contract to buy oil at low prices. Where was our government when that kind of deal was going on? Where is our government when it comes to protecting our interests in international trade? We should be moving in such a direction on short-term supplies of oil. If the government can make Canada self-sufficient in energy in ten years, clearly the petroleum problem is not a long-range one, assuming the government's program to be sensible.

● (1540)

We are an industrialized country. We have technical expertise. We can show the producing countries how to make the most, economically, of their natural resources. We have no right to rape them and demand from them their petroleum and give nothing in return except a few Canadian or American dollars. We should anticipate their demand for *quid pro quo*, just as Saskatchewan and other provinces are entitled to *quid pro quo*. The conclusion of such a technical and trade agreement would go far toward solving petroleum and energy problems, problems which

[Mr. Haliburton.]

the government has put forward as the reason for this bill which is nothing more than a grab for power and provincial natural resources.

After all, the OPEC countries are not really interested in our dollars or American dollars. They already have more than they can use. They want improved standards of living for their people, an enlarged industrial base and perhaps some measure of self-sufficiency. If we help them to achieve that goal, I believe we shall encounter no difficulty in making short-term arrangements for oil at cheap prices, as France has done. Having reviewed the context in which this bill has been presented, I ask, what is the government asking us to do? I refer to an article contained in the Halifax *Herald* of December 4 which reads in part:

A bill that would give the government authority to act in almost any petroleum emergency was introduced in the Commons by energy minister Donald Macdonald, who called for quick approval.

The government always asks for quick approval for something which it has delayed bringing forward. The article continues:

—the allocation board could supersede provisions in a number of federal statutes and overrule other federal agencies such as the National Energy Board.

The bill is to give the board power to take charge of railcars, ships and pipelines to move petroleum supplies to areas where they are needed most. The board could press even foreign ships into service. Pipeline companies would come under the jurisdiction of the board. They could be forced to build new branch lines and other facilities deemed necessary by the board. Presumably, the board could even force pipeline companies into bankruptcy. In other areas, the legislation would allow for relaxed anti-pollution standards and permit modification of contracts. It provides for individual rationing of petroleum and the issuing of ration coupons, and also for the power to ration electricity. The bill gives the board great powers. What has become of private enterprise? What has become of profit and loss?

Members last night said, "Oh, oh!" when I talked of this bill as being as far reaching as any wartime measure. For example, some industries which would be directly affected and indirectly controlled involve uranium mines, mineral fuel mines, rubber industries, synthetic textile mills, carpet, mat and rug industries, petroleum refineries, petroleum and coal products, manufacturers of plastics and resins, paint and varnish, fertilizer and agricultural products. Even if we disregard the fertilizer and agricultural input, this board will control areas of Canadian industry which account for just under 20 per cent of the total Canadian gross national product. This board will be very, very powerful.

In wartime, the emergency is clear; there is no question about there being an emergency. Certain powers must be exercised by one central authority. At present there is no evidence of an emergency. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) and the Prime Minister have not given us any facts and figures on which to establish an emergency. They cannot even tell members in this chamber from whom they are getting this advice or who sits on the technical advisory committee. Who are the