

*Petroleum Administration Act*

by the Canadian government. The NDP members on the committee will be proposing amendments to tighten up this part of the bill.

This is not the occasion to go through the bill clause by clause, Mr. Speaker, but one thing I would like to re-emphasize is that until the government comes up with a comprehensive oil policy to control the Canadian oil industry, to set forth the goal of Canadian self-sufficiency and to move toward it speedily, and to set up a system whereby we can control prices in Canada, we will have a series of these ad hoc bills arising out of crises that will develop in this very important sector in Canada. When we see what lies ahead of us in the next decade it seems to me more and more crucial that the government must move in the direction I have suggested, in the direction of government control and regulation of this precious source of energy on which the whole nation depends.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary North, on a question to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the hon. member talking about the price of crude petroleum now being \$6.50 a barrel. Didn't the Premier of Saskatchewan agree to that price, and did he not ask for a higher price, because he felt he should have the international price for Saskatchewan because a lot of its oil is exported, with Saskatchewan of course using a considerable amount of crude from Alberta? Didn't Blakeney agree to that \$6.50?

**Mr. Symes:** The situation of the province of Saskatchewan cannot be compared with that of Alberta. It is like trying to compare apples and oranges because of the amount of oil produced by Saskatchewan and because it is a have-not province. Nevertheless, in the circumstances, and under the guidelines with respect to the negotiations set out at that time, of course Mr. Blakeney had to agree to the best deal for the people of that province.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** If there are no further questions then before I recognize the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) perhaps I could present what the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) has suggested to the House by way of a point of order, and that is that this measure, if it passes second reading, be considered in a committee outside this chamber rather than in the committee of the whole.

Usually such questions have been reserved until the end of second reading and debate thereon, because sometimes the Chair can then sense whether such a change would be acceptable or not. But in fairness to the hon. member, and to all hon. members, perhaps I could put the suggestion now. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie is suggesting that this measure go into the committee on National Resources rather than into the committee of the whole. On this point of order, which I gather we could best deal with now, I will recognize the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald).

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I would be quite agreeable to that. The actual name of the committee is National Resources and Public Works, and perhaps by unanimous consent the motion before the House could be

[Mr. Symes.]

amended so as to delete the reference to the committee of the whole and make a specific reference to that committee.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Woolliams:** We certainly agree to that, and that is the reason we asked the question today.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All right then, it is agreed and ordered that the question be on second reading with referral to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, on rising to speak on Bill C-18 I must comment on the seriousness of this debate and on the lack of attendance by government members. It is they who are changing Canada's constitution one more time through this particular piece of legislation. As I say, this is a major debate on how we Canadians shall go forward from this day on if this bill is passed. This is the second major change in Canada's constitution that has been implemented by the government. I will not take the time now to deal with the first one, but the third one still to come has to do with the Canadian Wheat Board.

In the case of the first change, enabling legislation was passed by the provinces. That is not the case in this instance. No enabling legislation is necessary. The federal authorities are taking absolute control of the oil resources of the provinces, which at the moment happen to be concentrated in Alberta and Saskatchewan. In the negotiations at the energy conference on March 27 once again western Canada was taken by the ear to the woodshed by eastern Canada. I have no doubt that that is what happened. Why did Lougheed make what he said was the best deal possible? Why did he say that \$6.50 was the best deal possible? The answer is quite simple. What happens in the woodshed? The wood is put to the person brought to the woodshed. What was the wood on this occasion? The wood was section 92(10)(c) of the British North America Act which reads as follows:

Such Works as, although wholly situate within the Province, are before or after their Execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general Advantage of Canada or for the Advantage of Two or more of the Provinces.

● (1550)

The federal government threatened, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to use that heavy hammer on the provinces. Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Blakeney bowed to the heavy pressure. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they could foresee the huge constitutional legal crisis confronting Canada.

In Alberta we saw through the scheme of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of Canada a short while ago in relation to the Supreme Court. The obvious choice for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was a gentleman by the name of Martland from Western Canada. But no constitutional crisis in this country was going to be fought with something like a fair break in the Supreme Court with a chief justice who originally came from the province of Alberta. We do not have the same constitutional setup as the United States, so the Prime Minister can put anybody he likes into the Supreme Court without his action being ratified by this House or the Senate. He put a junior