

Mr. Lewis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I cannot seriously say that the rules would require my friend to withdraw what he said, but I suggest there really is a limit to the hyperbole that ought to be used with respect to my association with the multinational organizations.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the hon. member for York South was not at the committee hearings when the spokesmen for the multinational oil corporations was saying, "This is a beautiful bill". As I said earlier, this bill had its genesis in the technical advisory committee. I have my suspicion that the multinational oil companies, through their representatives there, had a lot to say about the kind of bill they wanted. This gives them the power to do what they have been doing—to allocate supplies offshore and domestically within Canada, and to do it under the cloak of government protection. My friend from York South is quite happy about that and in effect is saying, "Go forth, thou good and faithful multinational oil companies, and operate as much as you want under these conditions under the sanction of Bill C-236".

An hon. Member: Right on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre: That is right: just so we could find out what we expected.

An hon. Member: Macdonald is in bed with the oil companies, and so was Lewis.

An hon. Member: What was that award that Bill Twaits got?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) seeks the floor for the purpose of asking a question. This can be done only with the consent of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I think he should wait until I have finished. By then he will have had time to reflect, because his question may be no better than his speech the other day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Having dealt with this small question of the philosophical difference between myself and the hon. member for York South, and having driven him back to the refuge of his friends in the multinational oil companies, I should like to deal with this particular amendment.

I want to say to the hon. member for York South that we got the amendment in its present form to some extent from his colleagues in committee. We brought this up in committee because we felt, in our examination of the measure and the consequences that would flow from it, that a large number of individuals and organizations such as co-operative refineries and co-operative distributors of petroleum and other products, could suffer substantial loss or damage. So we attempted to introduce an amendment at committee stage. I admit that the amendment was in broad terms and would have offered a measure of assistance to people we did not wish to see benefit from it.

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

Some questions were asked by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) which persuaded me that we should try to narrow the scope of our amendment. This is what we have attempted to do.

Before we get into that, Mr. Speaker, let me give some of the reasons which persuaded me to proceed with this amendment. I did so because of what was said by the legal adviser to the minister who appeared before the committee. When he was pressed for his definition of "property", he gave what I considered to be a narrow and limited interpretation. He said, "'Property' means only real or tangible property—real property or personal property which is tangible".

Mr. Lewis: And he was wrong.

Mr. Baldwin: He was wrong. The hon. member for York South wonders why we did not give a specific definition. There are a number of reasons. We used the word "include", and by using that and the words which follow it we have made it quite plain that we were not intending to exclude other definitions, but it does include certain specific things. Let me pause and say this. My friend from Regina East (Mr. Balfour) read into the record some comments by the distinguished chairman, formerly a chief justice of Prince Edward Island and chief commissioner of the War Claims Commission, and also some of the comments of the late Mr. Justice Ilesley, who formed a committee to deal with this question. I say that because the War Claims Commission and the report which was dealt with and brought in by the late Mr. Justice Ilesley flowed out of the problems of the last World War and some of the actions taken by the government at that time. One can think of the resettlement of the Japanese people and a great many other actions taken during the Second World War which resulted from the War Prices and Trade Commission regulations. Because of that, and for other reasons, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), when he was prime minister, brought in the Bill of Rights.

● (2230)

The Bill of Rights resulted largely from the experience of the right hon. member for Prince Albert involving many injustices sustained as a result of the actions arbitrary of government administrative tribunals in the Second World War. So the Bill of Rights was introduced. It contains a provision that nobody shall suffer from deprivation of property without due process of law.

The government and the minister saw, no doubt, the difficulties that would arise in connection with the setting up of the allocation board, and seeing what damages might result from its actions they said, in so many words, "We must get rid of the Bill of Rights." The government had one of two choices. It could say specifically that the Bill of Rights should not apply to this bill. That course would have brought on it well deserved censure. Or it could put in a clause like clause 22 which, despite what the hon. member for York South has said, I suggest is less than worthless. Clause 22 provides:

The governor in council may make regulations providing for the establishment and conduct of a tribunal for the hearing and determina-