

Energy Supplies

opposite want to do is grab power? When the minister was speaking in the debate on an identical bill in 1973 he put his finger on the key question. I trust that he stands by what he said and that he will condemn this government and say, "I do not want to sit with them any more"—and join the Social Credit party or the New Democratic Party.

This article goes on to say the following:

Using this board under this act the government could eliminate rights of hundreds of thousands of Canadians. It could do everything from rationing the gasoline you may use to compelling a pipeline company to build a pipeline that would bankrupt it. Persons committing offences under this act, and under the regulations that will be approved by cabinet (not by parliament), would be liable to fines of as much as \$20,000 or two years in prison—

Then the article goes on to this very interesting part:

Because the opposition parties opposed the hasty and unconsidered and unnecessary establishment of such powers, the government has imposed closure.

Closure to get closure.

In the true arbitrary tradition of Canadian Liberal governments.

Mr. Boulanger: Explain to me what closure.

Mr. Ellis: Something that should happen to your mouth.

Mr. Malone: The best closure this House could have would deal with the oral cavity on the other side.

Mr. Boulanger: I am proud to be a Canadian but not with a guy like you.

Mr. Malone: I do not want to hurt unduly hon. members opposite, but they have the opinion that somehow we on this side of the House are the only people opposed to this bill and that we have no policies. I outlined some, but they were not listening. I mentioned a number of press articles which say that there is every reason to be opposed. I also note that a member of the cabinet has said that this kind of legislation is dead wrong.

Mr. Boulanger: Name him.

Mr. Malone: The hon. member asks me to name him. He is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Boulanger: That's a lie.

An hon. Member: Back off.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite says that what I said about the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is a lie. If he says that, he is also saying that what is recorded in *Hansard* at page 8763 back in 1973 is also such. Therefore I will be raising a question of privilege when I am finished my speech, and asking that the hon. member make a withdrawal.

I would like to put on the record comments made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce at that time. He said, and I quote:

—passing the bill before us would do nothing to create harmony among the ministers attending the conference; rather, it would interfere with the good will necessary if we are to meet the difficult situation which may develop in the coming winter.

[Mr. Malone.]

The minister later said:

It is headed for confrontation, particularly if we as legislators in this parliament do not caution the government and make it clear that the allocation bill we are being asked to pass represents a reach for power not granted to any federal government except in time of war.

● (2100)

Let me underscore what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said. He said that they were asking for power not granted to any other federal government except in time of war. Now members on that side would somehow like to point their fingers this way and say we are the only ones who oppose this. The fact of the matter is that, nestled in their own nest, is someone who pointed a finger and said virtually what we are saying at the present time. Then the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce went on to say the following:

Section 109 of the British North America Act provides for provincial ownership of mineral resources, and this was part of the making of this country of ours when it was put together under the British North America Act. This may have been a mistake, but we came together with that provision. What kind of a government do we have here that wants unilaterally to break that provision? I am not suggesting that Loughheed will not allow some changes, but I am saying that this government through this Bill C-236 wants unilaterally to break that agreement which eventually brought ten provinces together to make this country of Canada. We have heard a lot of talk about the fact that this Prime Minister is the one who wants to keep Canada together. He has not suggested that lately, because if he did no one would believe him.

I should like to give one final quotation because the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources tonight very unfairly accused us of being people who somehow held up this bill. The truth of the matter is that if we analyse the data it simply does not document that fact. I would like to put on record what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said, as reported at page 8765 of *Hansard* dated December 14, 1973. When he referred to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) he said:

I suggest he has no interest in hardly anything other than the promotion of the French language in Canada. That is about the extent of his interest.

Certainly that would not be the position of our party. We do not take a position like that. But somehow a man who felt that way about the government went and joined them.

We have received today a complete, unadulterated misrepresentation when the minister indicated that we have no policy. We could smother the government with policies. The government has attempted to create among Canadians the image that there is an impending crisis just around the corner, yet we have had a vacuum of policies and directions as to what we ought to do and where we ought to go. The government introduced Petro-Canada because it wants to nationalize. It put in an emergency measure bill because it wants socialistic style power. The government is attempting to get control for the love of embracing control.

Since the formation of the OPEC nations seven years ago, we have not had the establishment of an energy policy which would mean that Canadians relying on Canadian resources would have the energy they need. Instead of policy we have had confrontation. As a Canadian and as a member of Parliament I want to say that I am getting very, very tired of the fact that the government cannot put forward any kind of a position without first finding an enemy. I know why the bill is here. It