

*The Address—Mr. Waddell*

he is going to be around. However, it is no commitment at all, and I do not say that in a partisan way. I say wait, we can get a better commitment.

I hear some Liberal backbenchers putting in their two cents' worth. Let me address some remarks to them. One of the big issues in this particular matter is the role of Parliament. There was a Northern Pipeline Act passed. That was what Parliament wanted, and hon. members opposite said that there have to be guarantees. The Prime Minister says he is going to get around parliament; he is not going to come back and he is not going to have a debate. He will not have a debate in Parliament. He will not bring in a change in the act. He says it is like the St. Lawrence Seaway and that this is only building one little part. You build one lock and then another lock. Does that make sense? It is like approving the St. Lawrence Seaway and building the Erie Canal. It is approving a transport pipeline from Alaska and building an export pipeline from Alberta, and that is not logical.

The Prime Minister was being a sharp Philadelphia lawyer in deflecting those questions. He knows full well that it does not make any difference, but I think one of the reasons he is afraid to have a debate on this matter is that he would have to have a vote if he brought in legislation, and I suspect and hope there would be some Liberal members from the industrial cities of the east who might oppose such legislation.

What are they going to tell their constituents? Are they going to tell them that it will cost four or five times as much for gas in the future because of this decision? How are they going to explain that? Some of them might vote against it.

I refer hon. members opposite to the Liberal Party of Canada convention program, *projet de manifeste* or discussion paper at page 50, where it says the following:

The Government of Canada must be in the position to judge the energy security of each region and area of Canada. The operations of the oil and gas industry must be thoroughly understood and the national interest assured.

(a) As far as is practicable, a distribution network should ensure that all regions of Canada are linked to the provinces rich in energy resources.

Look at what the government is doing. It is taking gas and selling it out to the United States. Hon. members opposite are making a farce of their own energy policy. They are making a farce of their own convention policy. Is that the leadership that this government is giving? I hear about the new Liberals. Where are they?

**Mr. Tobin:** Right here.

**Mr. Waddell:** Are they prepared to stand for this program? Where are the new ideas?

The discussion paper also states, and I quote:

(b) Exports of energy or energy sources should be very carefully assessed to guarantee Canada's long-term interests.

If the government approves the pre-build, the government will sell out our cheap gas to buy back expensive gas in the future.

I want to conclude by making reference to two things. I want to refer first to the position of my own province of British

Columbia. If British Columbians and the government of British Columbia are worried about a proposed export tax on gas, that is chicken feed compared with what this pre-build is going to do. This pre-build will lock in all the gas in British Columbia and all the gas exports. It will be the end of the present markets for British Columbian gas. I am surprised at my hon. friends to the right, the Conservatives. I am shocked. There are 16 members from British Columbia, and not one of them has put British Columbia's interest ahead. It was the Prime Minister who had to stand up and count noses—“Are you in favour? Are you in favour?”

The other day the Conservatives tried to take cheap political advantage of the Liberals on the issue. They did not set out their own position, and it turns out that they are in favour of the pre-build. As a matter of fact, they approved a lot of gas exports. The 16 Conservative members from British Columbia are selling out British Columbia. I do not think he intended to do so, but in a sense the Prime Minister misled the House this afternoon when he suggested that western Canada was for this pipeline.

I read the telegrams from Premier Lougheed and the gas companies. What about those gas companies? Let us be fair; they are Canadian gas companies. They have a cash flow problem, and they have a surplus of gas. Last week Evelyn Gigantes, the MPP from the Ottawa area and our party's energy critic in the Ontario House, and I proposed that Ontario buy \$1 billion worth of gas from those small companies and bank it in the ground in Alberta. We proposed that it not be given away to the Americans but left there for the use of Canadians in a few years. I see an hon. member shaking his head. That proposal sounds sensible to me. It sounds like a sensible idea, and if the hon. member has reasons why it would not work, I wish he would tell me. But it seems to make sense for Ontario, Quebec and other provinces.

Let me conclude finally on this note: We on this side of the House take a position which is quite clear: we are against the pre-build. We think it is a sellout. We think it is different from the act. We think we can get a better deal. We would agree to the pre-build if we could get two things. The first is gas swaps so that we could get gas later on and keep our energy security. The second is that we get guarantees that the whole line will be built.

I am not known for being non-partisan, but I am trying to say this in a non-partisan way because I know the cabinet is meeting. The Prime Minister asked for representations, and I am giving him my representations in the best way I know. It seems to me that the policy put forward by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources when he was opposition energy critic was a sensible policy. He was right, and now hon. members opposite are going to turn around and destroy their whole energy policy.

In any case, I want to finish by saying that we on this side of the House have said that there is another issue. Oh, it is perhaps not as well known or as big, but it is just as important. That issue is the rights of Parliament. That is why we are digging. We are digging in because Parliament really is