

Summer Recess

Canadian ownership, of voting against low-income Canadians, of voting against energy security, so they are making a great deal of noise in this House. No doubt they are trying to shout down the revelation of their record, but as a party they voted against lower income Canadians, they voted against Canadian ownership, and they voted against Canadian security of supply. If they do not like hearing this now, they had better get used to it because they are going to hear a great deal more about their actions against Canadian interests.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Indeed, as one of my colleagues pointed out, they will be hearing a great deal more about their actions against the steelworkers, their actions against unions.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the record clearly shows that it was the Canadian people who in fact voted against the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Clark).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is a point of debate, not a point of order.

Mr. Clark: I regret that in the uproar which was being caused by the hon. member's colleagues I did not hear his remarks, but my colleagues who did hear him tell me I missed nothing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: I want to speak for a moment not simply about the contents of that energy package, important as they were because they faced, for the first time since the war in Canada, the great possibilities that existed for this nation to become self-sufficient in energy. I want to speak for a moment, for the benefit of the Liberal party, about the process that was followed in working out that package because I happened to read a most extraordinary chronicle in the life of Canada the other day, an interview given by one Pierre Elliott Trudeau to, of all people, the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. I thought that wonders would never cease when I read the account of that interview, until it became clear why exactly that interview had been given by that individual to that particular medium. The reason was that he wanted to build up the idea that there is no alternative approach to the confrontation politics which he has practised for so long at such a high cost here in Canada.

He suggested that what he termed as the non-confrontationist approach of my government has not worked. I want to give him one instance where it did work, and I wish him as much success as we had. When we began the process of working out an energy agreement which would speak to supply and security of supply for Canada, we consulted with the premiers of the country, Premier Buchanan, Premier Blakeney, Premier Davis, Premier Hatfield, Premier MacLean, and Premier Lougheed. We consulted with the premiers of the country. We did not take them a package which was a *fait accompli*, but we said, "Look, here is the goal for this country, a goal for a price which Canadians can afford and will have to face, but a goal

also which will take advantage of the great resources that are here and will build upon those resources."

I went to them as prime minister to premier and I said, "This is not a closed book, this is an arrangement, an agreement which conserves the interests of the whole community of Canada which we commonly serve." I received from those premiers several proposals that became part of that agreement and that were very helpful to the final package which was proposed. For example, it was the Premier of Ontario who suggested first that there be a relation that would not go above 85 per cent of world price and would naturally be protected after that by the *force majeure* clause.

● (1550)

We did not go to a province, as the Trudeau government so often does, and say, "Take this or leave it". We said, "Here is a proposal. How can it be improved?" Premier Davis made a suggestion that improved it significantly. We went to the Premier of Nova Scotia and said, "Here is a proposal. How can it be improved?" Premier John Buchanan and Premier Angus MacLean of Prince Edward Island co-operated with us in having the energy package that was brought forward reflect the special requirements of their parts of Canada. There were other items where we went to the premiers and listened to the advice of other governments, because we wanted a package which would not simply be a package that bore a party name, that would not be something that was forced down the throats of Canadians by a national government, but in effect would be a genuine national package reflecting a genuine national consensus and pursuing genuine national goals.

That kind of consultation will work in this country. That kind of consultation came within two days of working out a national energy package. If that package had been adopted this country would be much more secure in energy supplies than we are now, this country would be much better protected against the vagaries of the international market and against political changes which may occur in countries we cannot control, than it is now. That was a national policy worked out by a national government that was prepared to treat the provinces as partners sharing common goals, rather than as enemies who are there only to be confronted.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: One other dimension of the energy negotiation which is important to recall to the attention of the House and the Canadian public at this time is that we recognized, as I think most Canadians do, that the question of pricing cannot be separated from the question of changes in the equalization formula of the country. I will say to the House that we received advice from public servants and from others that the only way to approach that problem was to approach the two issues together. I considered that advice and I knew it would fail.

I knew the only way we could get agreement on those two important and fundamental questions in the country was to approach them in the proper sequence, and to recognize that in