

*S.O. 26*

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Let's withdraw Marc Lalonde.

**Mr. Clark:** If this government wants to have jobs for Canadians; if it wants to have energy self-sufficiency for Canadians rather than extending the grip of OPEC across this country, this country which uniquely in the world has the capacity to be free of OPEC's grip, which uniquely in the world has the capacity to use our energy strengths to build a secure future for ourselves; if it wants to free us from OPEC and free us for the future, then all the government needs to do is to create an investment climate that will provide the kind of certainty to cause investors to come here instead of causing investors to flee, which has been the policy and the consequence of this Liberal government.

What is at issue here is not simply a wrong-headed policy. What is at issue here is the fundamental question of trust.

*[Translation]*

I heard another member from New Brunswick, who had something to add. I hope he will find the courage this evening to speak in defence of his own constituents and not abandon them as he did with the financing program.

*[English]*

What is at issue here tonight is whether or not we will allow the Government of Canada to squander the future of Canada, whether or not we will allow the Government of Canada to continue a policy called Canadianization that has the consequence of driving active Canadians in Canada either out of the country or causing people who want to work, find jobs and build a future here, instead only to find hopelessness.

The question is whether or not this government is so bound to an ideology that already has a casualty list of unbelievable proportions, that it will not put the country ahead of the advice it is getting from "fonctionnaires", from public servants in the senior levels of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources; that it will not jettison the Minister of Energy in the interests of saving the country.

What we need to do in this country is to establish a climate of trust. We have operated without that climate. The consequences are all before us; project after project has been lost and job after job has been lost. Canadians are losing a sense of hope and they are losing a sense of the future. That is a betrayal of this country.

This debate offers the opportunity to this government to say, "All right, we accepted advice that was wrong. We see the evidence. We will change it." If the government refuses to do that, it is guilty not simply of blindness but of the worst kind of bad faith—it is guilty of the betrayal of this country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Harquail:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to put a specific question to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark).

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned my riding this evening. He said that nothing had been done in my riding. However, three mills which, with a federal subsidy—

**Some hon. Members:** Sit down!

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) should realize that a point of order is an appeal to the regulations and the Standing Orders of the House. It is customary, if a member rises on a point of order, that he refer to the particular Standing Order to which he wishes to make reference as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Harquail:** Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that there needs to be a procedural question. Usually at the end of a speech, an hon. member will entertain a question. Do members of the Progressive Conservative Party have the intestinal fortitude to follow the normal tradition they expect other members to follow, that is, when a question is put, would they have the courage to accept it? Does the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition have the courage?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Perhaps I could draw to the attention of the hon. member for Restigouche that the matter of asking a question is not an appeal to the regulations but is a courtesy that is sometimes accorded. I should also point out that the time allotted to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition had already expired. It would now require the unanimous consent of the House to allow a question. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Harquail:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank hon. members. The Leader of the Opposition, while he had the floor, was prepared to comment about my riding and to talk about the economy of my riding. Is the Leader of the Opposition aware of the fact that we have invested \$10 million at the mill at Dalhousie; \$14 million at the pulp mill at Atholville, \$19 million at Bathurst Consolidated and \$21 million at the zinc plant? This totals over \$70 million. Is the Leader of the Opposition prepared to admit tonight that he is not aware of the investment of over \$70 million of federal incentive money, resulting in over \$700 million of capital investment? Is the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition prepared to tell me tonight that he could stand in his place and make the statements he made and that he is prepared to deny the existence of the developments taking place in northern New Brunswick, that he is prepared to deny that the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester (Mr. Coates) had attacked him in the last federal election saying that he had not done enough for Atlantic Canada and he did not deserve to be returned as Prime Minister of Canada? Will he answer those questions, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, as it happens, I had occasion on the weekend to speak to the best friend northern New Brunswick ever had. I am referring to Premier Richard Hatfield. I