

what these same companies are prepared to give to the Norwegians and the English. That is backed up by facts. We are very critical of this. For example, a 75 per cent Canadian company that might be 70 per cent foreign owned should not get 93 cents back out of every dollar it invests. We do not think that 25 per cent is being voracious. We do not see that and we reject that kind of criticism.

People talk about the back in confiscation. That is utter nonsense. It is about time we owned our own resources. We should own more of them before they are all gone.

Recently I met with one of our messengers in an elevator. Before Your Honour says I am not in order for not speaking strictly about the bill, I want to say that he talked about energy prices. He earns roughly \$13,000 a year. He owns a single family dwelling. He's lucky. He probably could not buy one in Vancouver, or anywhere else for that matter. Last year's heating bill between November and April for his 1,200 square foot home was \$275. We are not more than two and a half months into that six month heating period as of this date, and he has spent \$100 more than he spent last year for the whole period. He feels it will be approximately double this year. Part of it is due to the cold winter, no question about it.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Why did you defeat the Crosbie budget?

Mr. Rose: If I am going to be heckled, Mr. Speaker, I would like a little clearer enunciation from the hecklers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose) has the floor.

Mr. Rose: I do not know what the hon. member said about their budget, but I wish the Tories would begin forgetting about that budget. They are paranoid about that budget. It is not just we here who rejected it, the people of Canada rejected it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kilgour: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is a new year. If we are going to have a relevancy rule in this House, if you do not rule the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose) out of order, you will rule nothing out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is attempting to administer the rules of the House in conformity with the wishes of hon. members. I invite the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody to direct himself to the bill before us.

Mr. Rose: We are talking about the price of energy facing Canadians this year. We know what it will cost to import energy. Prices are going up. We may not want to admit that, but we know it. Oil price hikes in terms of bringing on and making economically viable certain of the alternatives might in some sense be beneficial, with two provisos. What concerns us a great deal as New Democrats and nationalists is that if you are going to raise the price of oil and provide windfall profits,

they should not go to the multinational oil companies but to the people of Canada.

● (1620)

The Clark budget was going to spend \$90 billion over the next five years. We know that would provide huge windfall profits for the multinationals. We know also that for less than \$50 billion Canadians could buy back every foreign-owned business and firm operating in Canada. That does not mean to confiscate or expropriate them, but to buy them back. We should be on that kind of path. I do not know whether that is called the hard path or the soft path, but it may be the right one. We know things will get worse. We are concerned about two, namely, who will get the money and how will we protect the lower and middle-income people from these massive energy price hikes. The Economic Council tells us that within ten years the price of oil could be as high as \$155 a barrel, which will mean that a tank of gas will cost in excess of \$50. It is over \$20 now.

We have tried to present our criticisms of this bill. I suggested that far too much attention has been paid to increasing supply and not enough attention has been paid to decreasing demand. We have to protect people from hikes in energy prices, and we must try to get hold of the industry ourselves in Canada for Canadians.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is in Africa looking for ways to help the Third World. Aside from trying to bring decent order out of chaos in energy prices, he might suggest to his colleagues in the western industrialized countries that this lunacy of spending \$500 billion a year on the arms race be stopped, which would help the Third World.

[Translation]

Mr. Henri Tousignant (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, as one of the first members to take the floor after the Christmas recess, I am convinced you will allow me to extend to all hon. members on both sides of the House, as well as to you and all Canadians generally, my very best wishes, and to express the hope that the work of this House during the current year—there are still 353 days left—will be efficient and fruitful in bringing increasing justice to all our fellow citizens, while trusting that Canadians in general will understand that it is impossible for us to bring heaven on earth to each and every one of them. We are all human; when I say human, I mean of course that we are weak and imperfect, and perhaps it is better that it should be so.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to come back to the matter before the House, namely, Bill C-48. This bill will enable both sides of the House to express their views on exploration rights, production licences, royalties, in short, on the over-all Canadian energy policy. Naturally, several legal aspects of this bill remain hazy and difficult to grasp for the layman. This bill will show once again that in as crucial a field as that of oil and energy, the Canadian government has no intention of shirking its responsibilities. As I said, Mr. Speak-