

Energy

subsidies have to be given, let it be so; that the people in eastern Canada do not have to pay more for oil than those in the west.

Mr. Speaker, let us be honest and place the blame where it lies. When we, in the east, opposed the construction of a pipeline, it was not Alberta's fault but our own: we were paying less from Venezuelan oil. Today, we are told that we must purchase oil from Alberta. Mr. Speaker, we buy hardly any gas from the Arabs.

● (1640)

Most of the oil that we bought came from Venezuela. Once again, it is the same and Venezuela is ready to sell us more oil than ever before. Newfoundland could also provide some oil, but the minister says: Freeze because we have too much oil. We have no transportation means in 1973.

If the government had been farsighted and able to face its responsibilities, we would not now be in this situation, which is not disastrous, but artificial, and which was entirely created by the financial control, that is, for what counts, money and credit control. Some people may laugh when we Social Crediters say—yes it really is funny—say: Let us make financially possible what is physically practical. We have all the material, the manpower, the engineers and the wealth to discover and develop our natural resources. Why not use the Bank of Canada to finance, to make financially possible what we are physically capable of doing? Mr. Speaker, this would be a good and reasonable solution, one which would stop the government from tabling bills that have but one objective, that is to annoy and frighten Canadians by saying that the east will not have enough oil, that the west and central Canada will not have enough oil either. And so it goes in all other matters. My hon. colleague from Abitibi (M. Laprise) told me last week that during the great depression of 1929 to 1939, we had to starve to freeze while we had tons of wheat and now, we have to freeze, with oil wells so numerous that we have no use for them.

Mr. Speaker, I think a government led by intelligent and responsible people could do better.

Now, as to what the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis) declared, his objective is quite simple: to avoid the elections. They have no confidence in the government's proposals but they hope they will keep their seats tonight when the vote has been taken. Because they worry about one thing: to save their seats. Let's save our skin, wolves are coming! That is why they are consistently proposing to abolish multinational corporations. If we try to establish a national corporation the result will be the same.

That happened in almost all countries in the world where governments took over private industries. That operation often costs two, three and even ten times more than the normal operation of private industry. I think it is possible for a really private corporation and not a monopoly, where individual initiative is respected, to develop and to expand and by that time, we will be in a position to say that we have a true Canadian government for all Canadians.

Tonight we will vote on the motion. What will be our position? A short time ago I listened to the remarks of the

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) as well as those of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. Other members will also have the floor. The minister will have a chance to address the House in a few minutes and I hope he will not only say: we are facing home heating oil shortages. I hope he will not tell us as the university professor in Japan: Buy yourself a bicycle and start pedaling.

Mr. Speaker, we will listen to what the people have to say. Some of my colleagues will also comment on that issue and when the division will take place tonight we will vote without anticipating an early election. It is all the same for us. What we want is to get effective results for the Canadian people. What we want is that the government put finance at the disposal of all Canadian men, women and children, and not at the disposal of oil corporations and finance companies. Finance must be at the disposal of each Canadian family and each individual so that he can feel at home in Canada, our own country.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I should like to deal with a number of points raised in previous speeches, particularly three points of a substantive character raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in his speech and one of the points on which he coincided with the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis). In the course of his speech, it seemed to me the Leader of the Opposition touched upon really three points of substance, three energy issues of interest, although in all of them, with the possible exception of one, he failed to indicate, as he has for the past months, what exactly his party's policy would be. The three particular questions are: first, that of the price of oil in the Canadian market; second, the Mackenzie Valley pipeline and, third, the National Petroleum Corporation.

The Leader of the Opposition devoted the lion's share, of his speech, however, to talking about the pricing issue and raised particular criticism about the present situation where we have been able to sustain a freeze on crude oil prices from Canadian sources since September 4 and the remarks of the Prime Minister in which he indicated we would seek to extend that until the end of the winter season. I recall that at the time this proposal was put forward by the government, the friends of the hon. gentleman in Alberta, the provincial government there, referred to that action to freeze prices as being one of the most discriminatory actions against a single province in the whole of confederation. Yet, we heard the Leader of the Opposition talking today as though he were in favour of restraining prices so that Canadian consumers would not this winter have to bear the same impact as would be borne by people in other nations of the world. In effect, the hon. gentleman said that he was in favour of a one-price system, but he did not say what kind of a one-price system or by what means or mechanism he would carry it out. The hon. gentleman did not say so today.

● (1650)

He has said elsewhere that the one price system would in effect be a system of a higher prices for everybody, to be achieved by escalating the price of Canadian crude oil