

*Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

● (2100)

During the question period today a very valid question was asked in respect of consultation to begin in January when the federal and provincial energy ministers meet. I suggest a conference should be called to discuss the overall consequences of economic policy in order to determine what might happen and how it will affect Canada. Such a conference should discuss measures we can take to soften the blow for certain groups in Canada, if not for all consumers. It should decide on a policy designed to help all the nations of the world and to alleviate the plight of some of the more unfortunate nations. At that time the question was sloughed off as being irrelevant and not having much meaning.

**Mr. Baker:** The government doesn't have any answers; that's their problem.

**Mr. Murta:** In view of the situation we will be facing, unless we have meaningful consultation at this kind of conference on the broad economic base, we will face more difficulties. I think such consultation is essential if we are to experience any kind of general prosperity during 1974 and beyond.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) began his speech by asking whether there is an energy crisis in Canada. Then he proceeded to tell us there is no real crisis.

**An hon. Member:** We heard him.

**Mr. Orlikow:** He said that what we had in Canada was a shortage of oil in Quebec and the maritime provinces, and that in fact western Canada—which means all of Canada west of the Ottawa River—has more than enough oil, and the difficulties which Canadians are now experiencing are the result of the failure of this government to build a pipeline.

**An hon. Member:** Along with yourselves.

**Mr. Orlikow:** What the hon. member failed to say—he did not tell the whole story because if he did he would convict not only the present Liberal government but former Conservative governments—was that the decision not to build the pipeline to supply eastern Canada was made in 1961 by a Conservative government. That government decided it would be better for the oil companies in western Canada to leave the eastern market to the tender mercies of the multinational corporations.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, go back to your socialist party.

**Mr. Orlikow:** I presume the reason for this baying from the Conservative backbenchers is that they realize the difficulties we are in today are a result of a Conservative government's decision in 1961 that the maritime provinces and Quebec should be left to the tender mercies of the multinational corporations which would supply the needs of those provinces with crude oil from Venezuela and the Arab countries. Now that we have a shortage because the traditional suppliers cannot bring in oil, or if they can they are bringing it in at very substantially increased prices, we observe a sudden desire on the part of the

[Mr. Murta.]

official opposition to have this pipeline built. We have been calling for a pipeline for years.

**An hon. Member:** You have been having a pipe dream for years.

**Mr. Orlikow:** We have been calling for the construction of a pipeline under both Liberal and Conservative governments.

**An hon. Member:** You haven't called for one, really, at all until now.

**Mr. Orlikow:** I suggest that had this pipeline been built, we would not now expect the shortages in the eastern provinces which undoubtedly there will be this year. The hon. member for Lisgar joined his leader and the Conservative Premier of Alberta in urging increased prices. Let me put on the record what the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said a little over a week ago when speaking in Vancouver.

**Mr. Paproski:** It's on the record, baby.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Stanfield suggested that the federal government should be meeting with representatives of the oil-producing provinces with the idea of increasing prices in stages and working out arrangements leading to a Canadian price ceiling somewhat below the international level. The hon. member for Lisgar repeated that in a slightly different way.

**An hon. Member:** Why not?

**Mr. Orlikow:** The hon. member said that when the price freeze comes off at the end of the winter season, the federal government should discuss the question of prices with the provinces. I suggest he made a slight mistake in that he did not mean with all the oil-producing provinces; he meant the government should consult with the one province, Alberta, whose premier wants an increase.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Orlikow:** Certainly.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Is the hon. member aware that the province of Saskatchewan has just imposed, or made preparations for the imposition of a tax of \$2.20 on oil leaving Saskatchewan?

**An hon. Member:** What about B.C. and its socialist government?

**Mr. Orlikow:** I am glad the Leader of the Official Opposition asked me that question, because I want to spend a substantial part of my time putting on the record the policy of the province of Saskatchewan embodied in its new legislation, and the policy of the province of British Columbia in regard to gas, comparing that with the policy of the province of Alberta whose premier wants to increase the price of oil and gas not just in respect of exports to the United States but for all Canadians. The bulk of that increase will not go into the coffers of the provincial government but will go to the oil and natural gas companies. That policy is exactly opposite to the one