

### Energy

ments met to decide how markets should be allocated when there were surpluses. There was a vacuum, and the large companies filled it.

Today there is a shortage and oil has become a political issue. We have seen the formation of an organization of oil producing countries, OPEC by name, which is trying to get justice for their people. The oil belongs to the people of Algeria, Nigeria and the various countries of the Persian Gulf. We have been stealing this oil from them by paying very low prices for 50 years. OPEC is determined to get better prices.

When we contrast this picture of shortages in Japan, Europe and the United States with the surplus in Canada, we can see where the opportunity lies. Without going over the list of the 500 billion barrels of oil, the 700 trillion cubic feet of gas, the 100 billion tons of coal, the one million tons of uranium, the hydro possibilities, the potential of the Fundy tides, the Churchill River, coal in Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and the Maritimes, we have sufficient energy sources of the non-renewable sort to last this country for 500 years or more. There is no shortage. We have power from hydro sources which can be peaked with thermal power at very low cost.

How much do we hear said in this House about the renewables? By the year 2000 the United States will be into fusion at full speed. Where do we hear about research done on the hydrogen cycle? Where do we hear about magneto hydrodynamics? Manitoba sends cesium all the way to Russia because the Russians are doing experiments on magnetic hydrodynamics. But not a peep is heard about this form of renewable power in the course of our debates here. We have all heard of solar power, of tidal power and geothermal power. We have all heard of wind power.

**An hon. Member:** We have plenty of that.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** I have even mentioned in this House the word "biomass". If you were to cover the states of Alabama and Georgia with pine trees, which would grow in 20 years, the United States government could provide all the energy it needed from those trees. The energy of the future will be grown on a renewable basis on the farms of North America and other countries. Nothing has yet been done. The people in agriculture say it sounds like energy and the people concerned with energy say it sounds like agriculture; and the environmental people, who are charged with responsibility, say they have not got around to it yet. All my comments add up to this: we are not faced with a shortage of energy in Canada, either presently or in the future. Yet there is no national policy in place; nothing at all.

Transportation has been touched upon by the minister. Where is the policy on a national power grid which was prepared between 1958 and 1963 and left to lie somewhere in his department? Where is the knowledge which the National Research Council, in co-operation with Quebec Hydro, has accumulated? They moved further in the field of long-range transmission of power than any other country in the world. Yes, we knew about the possibilities of DC transmission 15 years ago. But these people have broken down the coronary loss as well as the line loss. There is no mention of it here. I think of the people of the Yukon, the people around the Fundy basin, the people of

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

British Columbia, Manitoba and Quebec: if they do build up any power production, where can they sell it? They have only one market opportunity and that is south, in the United States, this is what the NDP are voting for—the type of government which does not seize an opportunity.

There has been a good deal of debate about price. The reason for this is that neither the minister nor anyone else in his department has a clue about providing lower prices for energy in Canada while allowing enough funds to those who are out exploring to enable them to keep the system working. Because hon. gentlemen over there do not know what to do, they keep pressing us, "Tell us your policy." I suggest that our track record of knowing what to do, and the many years we have spent doing it, are sufficiently convincing: the people will understand that the only party which has a chance of devising a satisfactory energy policy or national resources policy is the party which now sits as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

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

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** With all our energy resources, we have enough going for us to enable us to bring processing into Canada without subsidies. The comparative advantage, the opportunity we have sought for so many years, is here. Sure, it means we shall have to do some bargaining. As I have reminded hon. members, Japan, Europe and the United States are short of energy. But when we consider all the things we have going for us, surely the people of Canada would benefit from a party in power that knows how to bargain in Canada's interests, instead of just sitting there and reacting to events day by day.

We, too, believe in the ownership of Canada by Canadians. The difference is that we want Canadians, as individuals, to own it and not follow the fatal route which Russia, China and other nations have taken, as a result of which they have to turn to us for technology because their socialist systems do not enable them to compete with the efforts of thousands of people all trying to do a little better.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in this argument about credibility I want to deal with the implications of the *force majeure* clause in oil contracts. When the minister stood up on November 26 in this House and for the first time told the Canadian people they had to expect a shortage of 200,000 barrels a day, my comment was very simple: I said it was a shocking revelation and that the minister would have to be prepared to answer questions regarding it. When those questions were asked by the Leader of the opposition and others, the minister replied that a *force majeure* clause was included in the contracts with the companies. In plain English, *force majeure* provides for an act of God, not an act by foreign international companies.

When we questioned the minister about this aspect in committee, he said this was a situation which we could not change. When I asked him to stand up and make a unilateral declaration on the part of Canada that we would hold any Canadian subsidiary responsible for action taken by a foreign parent company in invoking *force majeure*, all he said was that we must not touch private enterprise. Well, the NDP are supporting this type of thing. I have fought all my life for sovereign control by Canadians over the