

*Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

most of the leading newspapers have commented on his remarks on that occasion. Suffice it to say that his remarks were cheap, degrading and divisive. I will not read them because they have been repeated often enough.

At a time when we need a statesmanlike approach to a very complex problem we have a Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who displays all the talents of a bull in a china shop. We have a Prime Minister who takes cheap shots at the Premier of Alberta, and in general at all hon. members from Alberta.

**Mr. Paproski:** He wants ten barrels of oil for one French lesson.

**Mr. Kempling:** How can the problems we have be solved with the attitude displayed by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources? Is it any wonder that we have no confidence in them, and feel that the powers requested in this bill are too great for the meagre talents displayed by those who would be charged with implementing the legislation when enacted? But what of the industrial impact? We hear the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) stating again and again that all is well on the industrial front. But when pressed, he admits in a quiet voice that his assessment was made before the impact of the oil supply crisis became evident. Like the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources he deals in a large volume of statistics which have little relevance. Most of the replies he gives could be read from the Canada Year Book.

I asked the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources why he felt we needed seven years to become self-sufficient in oil when, in fact, we are producing 300,000 barrels a day more than we consume. His reply had no relevance to the question. In other words, the minister waffled because he did not have an answer. From the opening of the 29th parliament numerous questions have been put to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce regarding an industrial strategy. He is contributing, as usual, with replies which range from "we are working on one" to "we are not sure an industrial strategy can be developed because of the complexities of the problem".

● (1740)

Can you imagine why a country like Canada, with a surplus of oil and natural gas, does not have a world-size petrochemical industry? Can you comprehend why countries like Japan and Germany, which have no domestic oil and must depend on imported feed stock, have world-size petrochemical industries. One would have thought that a minister of industry, trade and commerce who would be sharing cabinet decisions on Bill C-236, would have had the foresight to realize that the petrochemical industry in Canada depends in the main on imported feedstock from the U.S.A. and today is facing a boycott of the export of that feedstock to Canada. Would you not have thought that the minister would have foreseen that situation? The industry has foreseen its vulnerable position for some time.

I had hoped the minister would have said long ago that Canada, with its surplus of oil and gas, was going to become a world leader in petrochemicals. It is a logical move and I would have thought he would be recommend-

[Mr. Kempling.]

ing world-size plants. Instead, however, we see him playing politics along with his colleagues, playing Alberta and Saskatchewan and their oil resources against the rest of Canada. I would have thought the minister would be in the United States right now to get a supply of feedstock for our petrochemical industry. The minister, like his colleagues did not see the oil crisis in time to act. They blame it on the Israeli-Arab war, on *force majeure*, on clauses in contracts or anything else that comes to mind. No one in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce seems to be tuned in to the petrochemical industry to be able to foresee their problems, let alone project a world-size plant which should be part of any strategy planned for Canada.

We do not appear to have a national transportation policy, and there are those who blame the minister for this. In fact, I think the department is really too big for one minister, and I believe it could be handled more efficiently if broken down into three or four departments. Now, we are faced with the problem of wheat deliveries versus oil deliveries, and I hope the minister will not play one part of the country against the other on this issue. I have heard some questions asked in the House about this issue, and the minister's replies have implied "What do you want? Do you want oil deliveries or do you want wheat deliveries?" Let us not get into that bind, Mr. Speaker, the problem is much too serious for that. Any government consistently using this approach does not have the confidence of the people of Canada, and in our view should not be trusted with the powers they seek in Bill C-236. I can almost see the headlines. I do not like to preach gloom, as I am basically an optimistic person but the headlines next year will be something like this: "Gillespie blames energy crisis for slowdown in industrial output" or "Turner blames world inflation for high interest rates" or "P.M. says conditions beyond our control reason for slow growth". It is always something or somebody else that is responsible for our situation.

Let us look at our trade relations. As an example, we have a trade deficit with every country in the world except Britain, Mexico and the United States. We saw the headlines in the newspapers the other day regarding the deficit resulting from the autopact. Now, we see that the situation in Britain has resulted in a three-day work week, it is a real crisis situation. I can see what is going to happen to our trade in that sphere. The minister will blame it on the Arab-Israeli war, the oil crisis, world inflation but he will not tell us that autopact negotiations have been stalled for months or that he has taken no initiative to have them brought to any conclusion. We are heading into GATT discussions in 1974 in a very negative position. We are facing a balance of payments problem if the trade deficits of 1972 continue. I do not think the people of Canada will buy the current excuse being put forth by the minister. In fact, if we end up with a serious trade deficit, I do not think they will buy it at all.

In Bill C-236 the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is asking this House to give the Governor in Council wide powers to regulate the supply, distribution, allocation, pricing and consumption of all forms of energy or any byproduct of an energy source. What the minister really wants is a club. He wants to say to the meeting of first ministers in January that he has the power, passed by