

a national energy policy that will protect the interests of future generations as well as the needs of Canadians today.

● (1630)

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the opposition motion against the government is clear enough:

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.

The content of this opposition motion is true. But at the same time I would like to see what the Progressive Conservative party has to suggest to replace the current policy. It is all right to hear them say: It is incompetent, inconsistent and vacillating. But they should suggest an alternative, we should know where the Progressive Conservatives would lead us.

We know that the government does not always tell the truth about Canada's oil situation. For instance, a minister says one thing and another the contrary. The same minister contradicts himself from one day to another. One day we are told by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) that the oil shortfall in the east will reach a daily maximum of 200,000 barrels. The next day he said that 60,000 barrels could be shipped by trucks and trains from Sarnia to Montreal. Our transportation capacity from Toronto to Montreal is estimated at 80,000 barrels a day by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand). He told us that an additional 80,000 barrels could be shipped from west to east through the Panama Canal.

We know that the Come-by-Chance refinery in Newfoundland can supply 100,000 barrels a day which would be shipped by tankers. Two days later we are told by the minister: We cannot ship this oil to Montreal because all storing facilities are full. But he added that later in the winter space will be available because certain storing facilities will be empty. But this will be winter time, and we will not be able to transport this oil. Mr. Speaker, if we can now ship oil, why do we let people freeze? Why do we let Canadians freeze if the oil is already in Come-by-Chance?

Mr. Speaker, we Social Crediters claim that there will be no oil shortage. But they frighten people by saying: We will lack heating oil and gasoline.

I read recently in *Le Soleil* of Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean:

If it appears in some eastern parts that there is already a lack of petroleum products, it is perhaps because the government statements frightened the people who reacted by buying exceptional quantities of oil and gasoline to be ready to face a serious crisis.

A distributor from here, Mr. Gauthier, not our hon. member, but Mr. Gauthier from Chicoutimi, and executive of A. E. Gauthier and Golden Eagle Canada Limited, said on November 30, and I quote:

Some customers would have had supplementary tanks installed which can contain up to 4,000 gallons, much more than the winter consumption of a family.

This is the practice now. Mr. Speaker, we maintain that the oils crisis, is used to frighten people and, as they say bluntly in the United States, it is designed to prepare an

Energy

economic crisis for 1974 and to condition people to accept it. We already feel the effects of this crisis in Canada. We are told that there is a lack of iron and steel. We ask for increases, for permission to increase the price of milk, because the cost of transport had increased, as energy costs more.

Mr. Speaker, the economic crisis policy has already started in Japan. After Japan, it will be the United States and then Canada. It is funny, sometimes, I ask myself questions.

How come we do not enough oil in Canada, in the western countries, according to the minister, and we do not hear about the oil crisis in Russia, China, Cuba and Algeria? One cannot go on making fun of the population.

A Japanese economist said and I quote an article from the *Montréal-Matin* of November 18, 1973:

The economy of Japan and other developed countries is heading for self-destruction, for a catastrophe in which the modern civilization will sink.

The frenzied race for industrial development rapidly pushes the world toward a disaster as radical as were then the fall of the Roman Empire and the Middle Age. We are coming the end of the modern era.

This pessimistic point of view is that of professor Haruo Naniwada of Wadisa University in Tokyo, and was published in an article of the "Keizai Orai" publication, economic trends of November, under the title "Let us be ready for the economic catastrophe".

This article was published in November 1973 not in 1914. In view of the artificial shortage of oil, let us be ready because we are not adapting financial means to our physical possibilities, to an economic crisis that will be the artificial shortage of oil.

I quote:

The Japanese economy is the most fragile, according to the professor, who is comparing its high rate of industrial development with the case of a cyclist: if he stops pedalling, he falls.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the minister is doing now; he pedals, and he has to pedal faster because problems are coming more quickly. And I quote the article:

The Japanese Cassandra mentions that the salary increases accelerate every year in Japan: it has gone from 10 per cent in 1966 to more than 20 per cent this year.

In 1973.

In the meantime, company debts have reached unbelievable proportions: the percentage ratio of real funds to borrowed capital is 16 to only one per cent.

All Japanese businesses are knee-deep in debt . . .

Like us, in Canada.

. . . writes the professor, which means that they must earn not only for themselves but also for the banks which supply them with funds. If they fail to manage, they go bankrupt. They are condemned to a mad race or death.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the present government suggests to us: Let us race ever faster, otherwise we die. But, eventually, Mr. Speaker, it is bound to happen. We will die sitting on top of a wealth of products. There is not a single Canadian, a single member of Parliament, not even the leader of the official opposition, who really believes in a shortage of oil in Canada.

That we should adopt a uniform oil policy, we agree. Prices must be the same from east to west. If transport