

*Policy Statement on National Resources*

Energy Board for the new element of stability and progress that it has introduced into Canada's energy policy since it was established. The minister himself recognized this when he quoted statistics showing the tremendous upsurge between 1960 and 1963, following the establishment of the National Energy Board, compared with the confusion that existed in energy policy prior to 1957.

What the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was trying to get across to the minister was that we recognize the important role of the National Energy Board and that at this important juncture in negotiations with the United States and the federal power commission the government of Canada or, as the amendment says, this house as a whole, should give some moral support to our own energy board in the critical negotiations taking place today.

We are not criticizing the federal power commission for its stand. It is defending consumers in the United States. What we are criticizing is the failure of the Canadian government to defend our own National Energy Board, and its failure to go over the head of the federal power commission, if necessary, so that we may have continued good relations between our two countries in the field of resources. Such good relations can only be achieved through mutual, intergovernmental understanding.

**Mr. Pepin:** May I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Certainly.

**Mr. Pepin:** Is the hon. member recommending that the government tell the National Energy Board to refuse the Westcoast application before holding a hearing and gathering all the facts?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** The hon. member is merely suggesting, as has been the case in the past, that the National Energy Board be made aware that the government and this parliament are anxious to support the principles laid down in the National Energy Board Act whereby the welfare and interests of Canadians should be considered as being paramount, especially when it comes to the question of exporting our own natural resources. This is exactly what the government is not doing.

In this case there are two private corporations involved, Westcoast Transmission in Canada and El Paso in the United States. El Paso had agreed that the Westcoast company's proposal was acceptable to it. It was happy to get gas on the terms laid down by

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Westcoast, but the federal power commission interfered with the happy relations existing between these two private companies. Surely one does not have to draw any diagrams in this respect.

When the United States government through its energy board tries to upset an agreement, which is in the best interests of Canadian producers and conforms to the regulations laid down in the National Energy Board Act, surely the only recourse is for the government of Canada to indicate through continuous consultation with the powers that be in the United States that this is not going to facilitate the happy relations which have existed between our two countries on export matters up to this point. As my father used to say, "A wink is as good as a nod to a blind horse."

**Mr. Pepin:** Is it the hon. member's recommendation that the government of Canada should have denounced the decision of the federal power commission before the second application of Westcoast came before the National Energy Board?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Mr. Speaker, I simply do not understand why the minister cannot grasp the point. It was laid before him in a lengthy speech by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. It is so simple that the "wayfaring man need not err." The minister knows the other part of that Scriptural quotation.

**Mr. Pepin:** I am trying to get from the hon. member exactly what he would have done, because the way I look at it is that we must first receive the decision of the National Energy Board. If that decision is a positive one, one favourable to the Westcoast new application, it will come before the government and the government must then decide whether to endorse it or not.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** The point is very simple. The minister and the government should indicate that they strongly support the arrangement which was reached between the two private companies concerned. When I had ministerial responsibility we were constantly in touch and in consultation with our American counterparts because of the obvious, close, economic relationships. For obvious reasons I do not have that entrée now.

**Mr. Pepin:** Was the hon. member in touch with the federal power commission when he was the minister?