

ment, nor has it been mine exclusively. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) is another member of parliament who in a way has always had one foot in each of the two solitudes that McLennan wrote about so eloquently more than 30 years ago.

It seems to me that what hurts Quebec members in this debate—in fact, not necessarily only in this debate; I say this in a spirit of friendship—is the constantly repeated charge that possibly Quebec members have sold out their province. Some hon. members opposite asked me during the lunch hour why this upsets Quebec members. “After all,” they said, “it is a debate and we are only making political points”. However, to be charged with selling-out the province has a particular connotation for a Quebec member that may not be quite apparent to people who do not come from that province.

For so many years those of us from Quebec, particularly the French-speaking members from Quebec who have sat in the House of Commons, have been charged with precisely the same thing, that they are selling-out the province. They have been charged with that by the separatist movement in Quebec. This rankles French-speaking Canadians who, despite the taunts of the separatists, chose to run for federal office, whether they were running for the NDP, for the *Créditistes*—as many of them have—for the Conservatives or for the Liberals. One thing we had in common is that we had all opted for federalism rather than separatism, and we did not think we were selling-out our province by standing in the House of Commons and endorsing the federal system, despite the fact that we had to stand this kind of abuse and vilification from the separatists in Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: So the connotation that we sold-out our province in those days was related to something entirely different, but not so different. Frankly and bluntly, it was related to the fact that many French-speaking members in this House opted for federalism despite the fact that working conditions in 1962 and 1963 were entirely different. This was at a time when presidents of Crown corporations might have said there was no room on their directorships for French-speaking Canadians, with the implication that they did not have the necessary intelligence or knowledge.

We knew differently, and they knew differently. It was difficult for them, despite these unintentional insults, to remain faithful to federal principles at a time when the wave in Quebec was diametrically opposed. So they have a right to feel a little proud of themselves, and not only the Liberals but the French-speaking members of the Conservatives and the *Créditistes*. When the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, last week said that to all intents and purposes the separatist movement is on the wane and that the French Canadian population have opted for federalism, I would point out that it was due in no small part to the participation of Quebec members in the parliament of Canada. And when they are accused, in another context, of having sold-out their province on the energy policy, they get a little angry.

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

● (1640)

Really, Mr. Speaker, what have they done? Once again they have had to go back to their province and say, “For the sake of national unity and federalism we must accept this energy policy, even if it means that we pay more for our fuel oil this winter as compared with the rest of Canada, particularly west of the Ottawa Valley line. But once again we are prepared to make this compromise because above all we are Canadians first and Quebecers second.”

Of course, it is difficult for a member to go home to a riding in Quebec or the Maritimes and say, “Look; we have really had the best of it for many years.” And, Mr. Speaker, we must not take anything away from the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) whose oil policy meant the development of oil reserves in the west. Without the captive market created by that policy, with cheap oil coming into the eastern provinces and filtering back into the western provinces, the oil industry in the western provinces could not have been developed. We understand that. We also understand how in 1969 the Conservatives recommended an extension of the pipeline to Montreal on the recommendation of Mr. Nichol, a former member of this House. It was not recommended because of any energy crisis that might arise; there was a desire to broaden the market for Alberta oil because of the quotas placed by the United States on the flow of oil from Alberta into the United States. This is logical and understandable. In other words, the time had arrived for it. The oil industry in Alberta had matured to the point where it could be competitive in supplying all the fuel oil needs for all of Canada and not just a part of it.

In other words, the protection provided to the oil industry in Alberta by the Ottawa Valley line was no longer necessary and people asked why oil from Alberta should not be exposed to a larger market. I agree with that concept. That is why there was agitation in those days to extend the pipeline. It was not because of concern that Quebec and the Atlantic provinces would be short of fuel, but in order to provide a larger market for Alberta oil which was restricted from flowing into the United States by the quotas set on the number of barrels that the United States would allow to be imported.

Earlier today the hon. member for Cambridge-Waterloo spoke very eloquently and with deep emotion, as he is quite capable of doing, being one of our better members. I may say that my participation in the debate the other evening was motivated by a discussion I had with a relatively new Canadian, someone who arrived here as a landed immigrant six or seven years ago and who has since taken out his citizenship papers. He has become a very wealthy businessman, and he appreciates this country more than most of us do. He talked about the fact that his business necessitated his travelling right across Canada. He talked about the magnificent coastline of British Columbia, which resembles the coastline of Norway. He talked about the tremendous experience he felt the first time he flew over the Rockies and saw the magnificent sight of that wonderful mountainscape. He talked about seeing the wheat in the prairie provinces just before harvest. He went on to talk about the industrial