

Petroleum Products Controls

regard to the question of these huge corporations when it is suggested that they are making uncalculated-for profits.

The next point I wish to deal with is the suggestion raised by the hon. member in paragraph (a) of his resolution which reads:

Place export controls on the export of gasoline and other refined petroleum products—

In this category, the hon. member offered what appeared to be rather alarming figures when he quoted the current amount of gas exports compared with earlier periods. The minister touched on this matter, but I think it deserves to be mentioned again. I believe the hon. member deliberately chose not to make it clear that the main increase in gasoline exports was not of refined Canadian products, but gasoline that had been refined in eastern Canadian refineries mainly from crude that had been imported to eastern Canada from other sources.

● (1750)

Surely it is wrong to conjure up in this House an image that Canadian fuel is being taken from our reserves, refined and exported to the United States in its refined form. The fact is that at the present time 51.8 per cent of the refining capacity of this country lies east of the Ottawa River. It does not have access to the Canadian crude to which the hon. member referred so frequently in his remarks. Is he suggesting that the refining expansion contemplated in eastern Canada should be discontinued? Is he hinting that it is wrong that some of the refineries which have come on stream and which are exporting gasoline products should be restricted in this type of exportation?

I should like to make it abundantly clear, as did my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), that we believe there should be export controls, if necessary, provided Canadian crude oil is involved and there is a suggestion that the refining companies are circumventing the regulations by simply taking Canadian crude and refining it with a view to increasing their exports. It should also be made clear that we do not feel the actual increase of refining capacity in eastern Canada, with a view to taking crude from other areas and exporting it in a refined state to the U.S. or elsewhere, is necessarily wrong.

The hon. member referred to a two-price system. What he chose to neglect was the answer to the question: Who pays for it? Is he saying that the producer has to accept a lower price if he sells to a domestic concern in Canada than he would receive if he exported his product? Is he saying that the producer must pay, or is he hinting that the federal government should end up subsidizing sales to domestic consumers in this country?

Let me turn, now, to the most interesting point in the resolution, one which I believe most hon. members would find inconsistent with the terms used at the beginning of the resolution itself. I am referring to item (c) which speaks about moving the Ottawa valley line and permitting offshore oil and domestic crude to move freely in the interests of price competition. There is the suggestion in this motion that somehow we should not allow petroleum companies to take advantage of international markets because, presumably, the price is higher and this in turn

would raise domestic prices. Yet at the tail end of this resolution the hon. member places a reverse twist on the proposition, saying that if we removed the Ottawa valley line then somehow that same foreign product would result in reduced prices in Canada. Is this not an inconsistent line of reasoning? I heard the hon. member's remarks on this subject and I must say they undermined greatly my own confidence in his proposal.

I believe there should be no suggestion that we in Ontario be left in a situation in which we might become dependent on foreign sources of oil or related products. At the present time we feel we have our troubles in negotiating prices with the province of Alberta. However, let me assure hon. members that we in Ontario would prefer to deal with the province of Alberta than to deal with foreign concerns with which we have no possible relationship.

I believe the one point which should be emphasized in our debate is that we in Canada are today seeing the results of the absence of any proper national resources policy at the national level. This is where the fundamental problem lies. There would be no need for a debate of the sort we are conducting today had the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) already proposed a national energy policy for Canada and had Parliament agreed to it. The type of innuendo the hon. member is attempting to put forward in his resolution would not be possible if there were a firm and all-embracing national energy policy established in this country.

Tied in with such a policy we need an industrial strategy. It is unfortunate that we are looking at the pieces instead of the over-all situation. In devising such a policy, rather than make statements which may not be helpful and which, indeed, in some cases may even be harmful in our trading relationship with the United States, we should accept the fact that the Americans are the best buyers of our products. Rather than being hostile, we should seriously consider what steps we should be taking, if not in the short-term then certainly in the medium- and long-term, to ensure that certain measures now being taken in the United States will not have unfavourable repercussions in this country at a later date. We should consider the possible effects, for example, of statements made by President Nixon to the United States Congress on April 18, 1973. I should like to itemize those points, but I see my time is running out. Perhaps on a later occasion I shall be given that privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member places the Chair in a quandary. Obviously, he could continue if he asked for and were given extra time, but such a request is not normally dealt with at six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, before six o'clock was called I had just concluded my remarks on the motion before the House, moved by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). If I could summarize the