

[English]

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. I did not, as the minister has stated—I feel I have to correct this—make an allegation. I asked a question. That is an entirely different situation. I feel I am certainly within my rights to ask a question that involves the expenditure of public funds without the calling of tenders or comparable presentations from other companies. I believe the minister was quite incorrect to make the charge that I made an allegation. He must feel there is something wrong or he would not have used the word “allegation”. He must have a guilty conscience.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Orders of the day.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### ENERGY SUPPLIES EMERGENCY ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ALLOCATION BOARD,  
MANDATORY ALLOCATION OF SUPPLIES AND RATIONING  
OF CONTROLLED PRODUCTS

The House resumed, from Friday, December 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-236, to provide a means to conserve the supplies of petroleum products within Canada during periods of national emergency caused by shortages or market disturbances affecting the national security and welfare and the economic stability of Canada and to amend the National Energy Board Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, on Friday at four o'clock I was about one-third of the way through my speech. Perhaps I might clarify some of my remarks. I had been speaking on clause 35 of the bill. As the title suggests, the provisions of the bill are to be invoked only if there is a national energy emergency. I would therefore question the propriety of clause 35(4) which reads:

An order under subsection (3) shall be laid before parliament not later than fifteen days after it has been made, or, if parliament is not then sitting, within the first fifteen days next thereafter that parliament is sitting.

It is my contention that if parliament is not sitting when the emergency is announced, parliament should be recalled immediately. There are precedents for such action. Earlier this year when the railway unions went on strike there was a national emergency. Part of the country was in danger as a result of lack of transportation and parliament was recalled immediately. I think that if an energy emergency should arise in this country, the situation would be important enough to justify the immediate recall of parliament, when the matter could be debated. What better forum is there for debating such a matter than one in which 264 members of parliament can explain

### Energy Supplies Emergency Act

the situation in the various areas of the country? For that matter, even if parliament is sitting when the emergency arises I think the House should immediately deal with the emergency by debate and perhaps a vote should be taken on the question.

I have one question regarding the validity of the bill. I am referring to that part between clauses 1 to 10 inclusive. I am curious to know, as I am sure all members of the House are, why the energy allocation board should be made directly responsible to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and be controlled by him. I suggest the board would be more respected and more acceptable if it were an autonomous body and if it were available for consultation with the minister and the department as well as with private industry. Perhaps, if necessary, in the performance of its duties it could even consult with those with expertise in this field on my side of the House.

The wide-ranging powers requested in this bill with respect to alternate fuels are too autocratic and totally unnecessary. The provinces are trading their resources, one example being electrical power. That resource is being traded among the provinces now and I am sure they would be willing to do this automatically in a situation in which one province is short of such power.

Clauses 13 to 15 inclusive of this bill will lead, I believe, to complete control over all of Canada's non-renewable energy resources being vested in one man responsible to the federal government of Canada. The federal government's relations with the government of the province of Alberta are now, to put it mildly, strained. I would hate to see what would happen if the clauses of this bill were invoked should an emergency arise and the government had the authority to legislate the bill's provisions within the province even without consultation should they feel it necessary.

● (1520)

The province of Alberta and the oil industry have grown together over the years. By virtue of this development, the Alberta government has developed a great amount of knowledge and expertise in the field of energy and resource management. Consultation on energy matters with the provinces in general and Alberta in particular will be much more beneficial to the government than their present policy of consultation, which seems to be only with the New Democratic Party. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), by virtue of his Vancouver verbal attack on Premier Lougheed, has set the stage for confrontation at the forthcoming first ministers' conference in January. For the sake of all concerned, I urge the Prime Minister to change his approach from one of confrontation to one of consultation.

I have already voiced my objections to some of the requests made in this bill—for example, the severance of consultation with the provinces in energy matters and the granting of autocratic powers to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I would also like to express my displeasure that the government would request this House, in the case of an energy crisis, to revoke the Combines Investigation Act, various transport acts and environmental considerations should any or all of these interfere with the invoking of Bill C-236.