

The minister was referring to me.

—do not believe this is the best way to proceed on this question. That is why a full and detailed study is being undertaken.

It may be undertaken; yet the point is that there is no provision for rapid transit facilities on that bridge. I must have nettled the minister. He is usually quite affable and friendly. I do not know what I did to upset him, but his reaction seems to suggest that he thought I was questioning his experts. I did not suggest his experts were wrong. My purpose in asking the question was merely to ascertain whether, in spite of his fine words, the minister was really sincere about the future of rapid transit in any city. I have decided that he is not.

We are about to spend \$21 million of public money on this bridge over the Fraser River, to serve principally the Vancouver international airport on Sea Island. Since this bridge may have a lifetime of 50 years or more, and the recent greater Vancouver transportation study—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Rose:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, since a few points of order were raised just before I began, I wonder if I might be allowed the extra time that was taken.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The Chair has taken into consideration the two minutes taken up that way after ten o'clock. The hon. member began just about two minutes after ten. All I can do now is ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Duquet) to reply.

**Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) has raised the subject of rapid transit systems and their potential as a future form of transportation in Vancouver. I know from listening to the hon. member that he has acquired a more than adequate knowledge of this very complex subject. I join him in expressing concern about the need to provide fast-moving transit systems in our larger cities, including Vancouver. It is something we should be looking at now, and I am pleased to note that in fact close consultation is under way with many major cities.

On the question of a rapid transit system to the Vancouver airport, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), in his answer to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) on December 17, explained why it was not possible to become involved at the present time in the general form of rapid transit which was being proposed for the greater Vancouver area. Within the Ministry of Transport there has been established an urban transportation development division. It is responsible for a program of research and development, and it is in constant communication with interested groups across the country on the complex subject of public transportation.

I wish to assure all members that a great deal of work is being done on this matter, and I am advised that the subject is being studied intensely by all three levels of

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

government. I would be pleased to inform the minister of the several additional points the hon. member raised this evening.

• (10:10 p.m.)

[Translation]

OIL—POSSIBLE REVIEW OF NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD POLICY

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, on November 26 last, I asked the following question of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Since the Caloil Company of Montreal announced it was dropping plans to build a refinery in St. Augustin in the Portneuf riding, because the National Energy Board has refused to allow it to sell imported oil west of the Ottawa Valley, could the minister say whether the policy will be reviewed and amended as required?

Here is what the minister said in reply:

No consideration is being given to changing it because it is felt that it was adopted in the interest of the whole country.

This prompted me to ask the following supplementary question:

Does the minister know that the trade barrier put up by the National Energy Board between Quebec and Ontario is a one-way barrier since Ontario can still sell oil in Quebec?

The minister kept to his seat preferring not to answer any further.

Mr. Speaker, because I had mentioned that I wanted this matter to be discussed, my name was put on the list for Tuesday, December 1st. This list, as everybody knows, becomes official only at 5 p.m. when it is read by you. But hear this: at 4.45 that same day I received a telephone call from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) who had been asked to answer for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, who was not in attendance. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was merely asking me whether I would not be kind enough to postpone the discussion to a later date because, he said, he did not quite know what to reply.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I feel that the policy of the National Energy Board is in need of revision is that with the population of Quebec I realize the government is trying to direct the refining and petro-chemical industries toward Ontario, which is a sabotage of the development of a peak sector in Quebec.

It is true that the Supreme Court did pronounce a judgment recently but it is also true that the companies involved were represented there by their lawyers, who believed they were right.

In short, even if we recognize the judge's authority to dismiss a case, this does mean that his verdict is always fair.

Allegedly to protect western oil, whose free access to the United States is now announced, very high prices for oil are allowed to be maintained in Ontario, thus increasing profits from these operations and attracting in the province maximum investments in the refining industry.

In order to continue this game, even the smallest quantities of oil must be kept out because, if sold at a lower