

document, that the agreement can be contained in reciprocal orders in council. We can discuss this matter later, but I want to point out now that neither this House nor any committee of this House should be asked to pass legislation giving authority to the government to impose a price mechanism on the basis of an agreement that we have not seen and of reciprocal orders in council that have not been tabled. This I hope the minister will do before this bill is dealt with any further.

My concern is that this bill is supposed to crystallize the agreement between the Prime Minister and the ten provincial premiers who met and agreed on the pricing of oil, on the compensation and on the surtax. Clause 36 shows very clearly that the federal government wishes to take over control. When dealing with price, the Prime Minister and the minister said that the question of price in the agreement would last only 15 months. I would refer you, sir, members of the House, and indeed the media, to clause 36 which provides:

Where no agreement is entered into pursuant to section 21 with the government of a producer-province, or any such agreement is terminated by the declaration of the parties, or, in the opinion of the governor in council, is not effective or is not capable of being effective, the governor in council may, by regulation, establish maximum prices for the various qualities and kinds of crude oil to which this part applies—

What I am saying is this: clause 21 deals with the agreement. There is nothing in writing. The agreement was reached at a luncheon meeting. The premiers and the Prime Minister came out and held a press conference. The only thing we know about this agreement is what we read in the press and the fact that it was held in secret.

Clause 36 in effect says that if that agreement is terminated, and it will be in 15 months, or if there is a feeling on the part of any province in breach of the agreement, then the federal government can move in and make the decision through the governor in council, which means through order in council by the cabinet. This is the reason I am very pleased the minister agreed today, after interrogation on my part yesterday and today, to send this bill to a standing committee provided, of course, we are to hear witnesses from the provinces, from the companies and from the consumers in respect of the bill as it is written.

The question we must ask is whether this bill really expresses the agreement that was entered into verbally on March 27. There are a few things I should like to say before I close in reference to what has happened in the past few months. There has been talk about shortage of supply and about the fact that the supply of 200,000 gallons per day dropped down to 50,000 gallons a day, and in the end we did not know what the supply would be and what the shortage would be. As I have said, there was not an energy crisis in Canada. There was a transportation crisis.

If this government since it took office had built transportation facilities from the west by pipeline—not from Sarnia to Montreal, which means only an additional 15,000 barrels of crude petroleum a day—to carry crude petroleum into Montreal, and indeed to the maritimes, would we have had sufficient supplies of crude petroleum in Canada to supply our needs without any importation. Therefore, I agree with the former leader of the NDP when he talks about the bill setting out certain terms which mean, of course, control by the federal government and the taking away of control from the provinces. This is the reason I am pleased the bill is to be referred now to a committee, before which I hope we will be permitted to

*Petroleum Administration Act*

call witnesses and to hear evidence from the provinces, from the oil companies and from the consumers' associations to determine exactly what is meant by clause 36.

● (2010)

Clause 36 says that if the price freeze runs out in 15 months, and that is what the Prime Minister spoke about on March 27, then the federal government can pass orders in council and thus will control not only the price but will compensate the industry and move into the field. I say to you, sir, that that is totally unconstitutional.

What I would have liked—and this has been my ambition since I have been a member here—is the government to have had the vision to see that free enterprise should continue in the exploration and development of crude petroleum and natural gas, not only in Alberta and Saskatchewan but in the Arctic and offshore in the maritimes. We should build pipelines so as to supply the whole of Canada. Every day we export one million barrels of crude petroleum to the United States, and we import into Canada the same amount either from the Middle East or Venezuela. Our imports and our exports are just about equal. But if we had had a government with vision, a government which realized the possibilities which exist in this country—in the same way the CPR was built—we would have the means of transporting energy from western to eastern Canada.

We should be self-sufficient in this natural resource. Before supper I pointed out that we will have a sufficient supply of crude petroleum if the tar sands are developed—apart from what might happen offshore—for 100 years, not only to fulfil our export commitments but to satisfy our own needs as well, and sufficient natural gas for 250 years. Men with small minds, men who want to play politics with regard to this subject, will tell you that we will run out of these natural resources by 1980, because what they want is adversity for the sake of power. What I want to see in this country is a new national dream, a new transportation system to transport energy and gas which would come down from the Arctic by pipeline, with the help of the United States, to the industrial centres of eastern Canada and indeed to the industrial centres of the United States, each country paying a price to transport those resources under a joint venture, joint financing, because in the oil and petroleum industry risk capital is needed.

Members of the NDP always say that we will run out of oil and gas. I say that we would run out of them if we accepted their philosophy. They do not want to give anything to industry. They say, "We have this much and we will share it with the people of Canada." But I say if we had vision with regard to corporations we would provide the average man with incentives to enable pipelines and transportation facilities to be built. There never was an energy crisis in Canada. That was fiction and built-up emotion because of the ineptitude of the government and its inability to provide leadership. That can be proven today. The Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) has bought, this winter, heating fuel at 89 cents which we now know is worth 13 cents to 15 cents.

**An hon. Member:** Ninety-nine cents.