

*Energy*

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Blenkarn:** What about your own policy?

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, may I interject this: the rules allow me only 20 minutes. My colleague, the House leader of our party, asked the spokesman for the Conservative Party whether my time might be extended to 30 minutes and this request was refused. I, therefore, think that those hon. members should do me the courtesy of allowing me to speak and not use up one quarter of my time with silly catcalls.

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

**Mr. Stanfield:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the House leader of my party knows nothing about any such request, but I will be happy, and I know my colleagues will go along with me, to accord the hon. gentleman the 30 minutes which he wishes.

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, without trying to spin the argument out, but not wishing to be called one who does not tell the truth, let me say that I proposed very clearly to the official opposition House leader that the leaders of the smaller parties should have 30 minutes, and I was told the answer was no.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste time. According to my understanding, the proposition was 30 minutes for both major leaders and for other speeches, after that, 15 minutes.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** With respect, that is not correct.

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, with respect, the deal was not for 30 minutes. However, we are generous enough to give the hon. member 30 minutes, if that is what is bothering him. We, however, want to follow the rules around here.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Is it agreed that the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and the principal spokesman for the Social Credit shall have 30 minutes.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that that was asked for before I had started. I might not need 30 minutes. I want to keep within the rules, if given the opportunity. If hon. members will not give me that opportunity I can try to handle that situation, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that step by step the NDP has wrung out of this government an oil policy in the direction of Canadian interests. I want to emphasize that important differences still remain. However, the policy announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) last Thursday is now pointed in

[Mr. Lewis.]

the right direction. It is so pointed for the first time since the Tory national oil policy of 1961.

I remind hon. members that early in the year we demanded export controls on oil and petroleum products and, after some time, Canada got them from this government. Months ago we demanded a two-price system so that Canadians would not be gouged with domestically produced oil in the hands of the multinational corporations. We said that the only way to have a two-price system without the multinational corporations getting huge windfalls was by having an export tax. I remind hon. members that it was the NDP spokesmen who made these demands. Eventually, these became the policies of this country.

We set out in motions, as moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) on May 28 and October 25, a number of items to do with a proper and appropriate oil policy which this country should now have. Those items involved a continuation of the price freeze beyond January 31 and a continuation of the export controls. We said we must have an end to the Tory Ottawa Valley line and bring the pipeline to Montreal. We demanded the establishment of a publicly owned national petroleum corporation, with wide powers to engage in exploration, development, production, wholesale distribution and, if necessary, in retail distribution. We demanded a large public involvement in the development of the tar sands.

Last Thursday, stimulated by a desire to remain in office, the Prime Minister of Canada adopted all the policies which we proposed, in a way which is not entirely satisfactory to anyone who thinks about the future of this country,—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lewis:** —but in a way which creates for Canada a new national oil policy of importance.

According to the newspapers, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said in Vancouver the other night that he was not following NDP policy. He was merely implementing the report on energy policy for Canada, promulgated last June 28. I think it is a pity that his advisers did not draw the Prime Minister's attention to some of the statements in this report. One of the items which he announced in his policy announcement of last Thursday was the building of the pipeline to Montreal; a second item was the establishment of a national petroleum corporation. With regard to the pipeline, page 14 of the policy statement to which he referred in Vancouver says: "To date, the security threat has not appeared serious enough to justify the very costly arrangements of supplying the region east of the Ottawa Valley with western Canadian crude oil." If he had been following the advice of this report, he would have been against the extension of the line to Montreal, and not for it. He was not implementing this report at all, and he knows it.

With respect to the national petroleum corporation, the same report did a balancing act when it said that there were advantages, which it meekly described, to such a publicly owned corporation. Then, on pages 189, 190 and 191 the report goes on practically to frighten everyone who thinks of it as to the disadvantages of a national petroleum corporation. If there were any conclusion