

The question before all of us in deciding the major issues that come before this House, which are particularly the responsibility from time to time of the government, is whether in any specific decision that is taken we are steering a course toward that kind of positive Canadian nationalism wherein will lie the best interests of the country, or whether we are acting in a negative nationalistic sense, for the purpose of short-term gain political or otherwise rather than in the interest of that positive Canadian nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, we should view the decision of the National Energy Board to export 6.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, that decision having been approved by the cabinet, in light of the basic question of whether this was a positive decision which would be conducive to Canadian nationalism in its best sense, or whether it was a negative decision in favour of the country of import and against the Canadian national interest.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, if we as a nation want to reach the objectives we have set ourselves, we must build on a sound economy. It would be a gross error to yield to emotions and to take unjustified decisions, from the economic point of view.

It would badly serve the cause of Canadian nationalism and engage it more surely on the way to frustration and failure.

[English]

In other words, Mr. Speaker, essential to that positive Canadian nationalism and to our ability to build a strong and unique Canadian house is that we have the strength, the will and the ability to tend well our own garden and to build a strong economy by adopting such sensible policies as will serve the Canadian interest, present and future, so that our young people may have continually widening economic opportunity, as well as opportunities in other areas of human endeavour. I do not think that Canadians have made a national decision to return to Walden with Thoreau. I think they want here growing and expanding economic opportunity. No single factor would contribute more to the dissolution of the Canadian state and enable others to take over our economy, if they so desired, than not running our own ship well and not managing our own economy well. I should like to approach the decision in respect of natural gas on that basis.

I should like for a moment to turn my attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). He has made a valiant attempt to satisfy the two irreconcilable appetites which exist within his party. On the one hand he tells us that we ought not to use our energy resources to "feed the voracious appetite of American industry," further, that our move has placed Canada completely at the mercy of giant oil corporations of the United States and that we have moved one more step in making Canada an economic dependency and military satellite and a cultural colony of the United States. Those are fighting words indeed. But I wonder if they are words spoken in that positive,

#### *The Address—Mr. Greene*

Canadian national sense, or are they of that very negative kind of nationalism which is meant to arouse hatred or animosity toward some other people or nation, instead of enhancing our own positive, real and unique Canadian nationalism?

Whatever else those words did or did not contribute, we know one thing that they did—they satisfied, possibly, the Waffle group. But the hon. member's task is not that simple, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand there is an older and wiser element within his party whose appetite is for power and for office. They realize that this Waffle nonsense will keep them sitting where they are today, in even smaller numbers than at present.

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

**Mr. Greene:** To placate the office-hungry people of his party he said later in his speech, "We do not object to selling to the United States any of our surplus energy resources provided Canadian long-term needs are taken into account"—which the Energy Board has done—"and provided we gain access to the United States for Canadian semi-processed and finished products" which, as I mentioned, is happening to an increasing extent almost every year of our history. Both quotations, Mr. Speaker, were taken from the speech made by the hon. member in the debate. I trust that the contradiction has satisfied both halves of the two-headed party which he now leads.

**Mr. Skoberg:** The minister belongs to a no-headed party.

**Mr. Greene:** It must be said, Mr. Speaker, that the duality of the Leader of the New Democratic Party makes him a formidable opponent and a formidable adversary. One never knows whether the swing will come from the left or the right, whether the hon. member is talking at any given moment from the Waffle side of his mouth or the office-seeking side of his mouth.

The decision of the Energy Board, as approved by the government, to permit the export of surplus Canadian natural gas was made in the Canadian interest. That is the one aspect of the decision to which we must address ourselves. I feel sure that our customers for this product in the United States of America are well able to take care of themselves. They will determine whether the sale is in their interest. We for our part should determine only one question: Was it in Canada's interest? I intend to devote my efforts to answering that question in the affirmative. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the decision of the board, confirmed by the government, is the only decision that could be made consistent with good, economic sense.

The total value of the new pipeline facilities to be constructed in Canada under these and associated authorizations issued with respect to the applications is approximately \$200 million. The Canadian content of the facilities will be approximately 80 per cent and some 13,000 man-years of work will result in Canada. Of this total, about 30 per cent of the employment effect will occur in