

fuel allocation and allocation of its use. The number of industries directly affected by allocation measures may be seen or understood perhaps, when one realizes that almost 20 per cent of real domestic product can be directly controlled by the Governor in Council under this particular bill. So, we see the wide powers that can be exercised through the use of this measure.

● (1630)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the powers of this bill are far too great. They are far-reaching. I do not see how they could be justified under current circumstances. The government, if ever given some of these powers, should be given them only if it has been established that Canada will in fact suffer a major energy crisis. The Prime Minister has stated again and again that we are not faced with this energy crisis in Canada.

Mr. Roy (Laval): When did he say that?

Mr. Patterson: He said that. You do not listen to your own leader. If you would listen to someone you might learn a little bit. The only power the government may need now is authority to ration. The government has at its disposal adequate legislative authority to deal with most of the other energy problems facing Canada today. We must ask ourselves this question—and I include government members—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has not expired, but I would ask that he be permitted to finish his speech. I have allowed some considerable latitude. He certainly provoked a large number of other debates in the chamber at the same time because of his remarks, but I would ask that he be heard in conclusion.

Mr. Patterson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not disturbing me at all. I can usually shout anyone down if I have to. However, I was just drawing my remarks to a conclusion. I would say we must ask ourselves this question: Should the far-reaching powers of this bill be given to a government that has shown itself to be incompetent and incapable of handling even the situation which exists at the present time?

An hon. Member: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Patterson: I am very happy to speak for myself, and I say I do not believe we ought to give the government the authority it is requesting in the bill as it presently stands.

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for recognizing me. By taking part in this debate I wish to enlighten some closed minds from Quebec, in particular that of my hon. colleague from the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner)—

Mr. Wagner: Talk about the bill.

Mr. Olivier: That's nothing. It's just the beginning. Wait a moment.

I want to point out the meanness of the hon. member's attack on his colleagues from Quebec irrespective of their

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

party. In fact, he suggests that he can show us how to govern and especially how to assume our responsibilities towards Quebec. I will call the attention of the House to the manner in which—

[English]

Mr. Paproski: You should listen.

Mr. Olivier: You, too, should listen.

[Translation]

As I was saying, I will call the attention of the House to the manner in which this hon. member attempts by all means possible to make us forget what fate people like Borden and Bennett inflicted on the province of Quebec. I think that this is indecent behaviour on his part, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wagner: Talk about the bill.

Mr. Olivier: Yes, but I also will talk about the Borden line that the Progressive Conservatives forced upon us in 1961. Where was the hon. member in 1961, when that happened? What was he doing at that time? He was going from one "chair" to the other. He was getting ready to watch his positions in order to become judge, come down, move up again, come down again.

Mr. Wagner: Talk about the bill.

Mr. Olivier: Does the hon. member wish to ask a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Wagner: No. Only that the hon. member returns to the bill.

Mr. Olivier: I see. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe would be kind enough to listen; I think that he would be happy to hear someone who is able to give a speech without letting show any partisan feelings. If you refer to his vocal diarrhea of last night, you will note that what he is getting today is a direct consequence of his flow of words.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members who took part in this debate have shown a great deal of interest in the bill which we are now debating.

From the speeches made hon. members representing the Progressive Conservative Party, it is obvious that they have not been able to tell us what would be their policy if they were in our place.

An hon. Member: They have none.

Mr. Olivier: I certainly did not hear one. Does the Progressive Conservative Party have a policy as concerns this issue? No one can say.

An hon. Member: It has none.

Mr. Olivier: I cannot ask the Progressive Conservative members from Quebec to tell us about this policy. There are two of them, and they never agree, Mr. Speaker. For the solution to their problems they called upon Mr. Masse. They conclude: We shall be three, so we might perhaps agree.