

*Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

act with dispatch, then the government ought to accept the responsibility of building the pipeline itself and put it under public ownership. As a matter of fact, I think the time is long overdue when we ought to bring the whole pipeline structure under public ownership. There is no excuse for delay. The government should be able to make the decision with respect to the route.

If the difficulty lies in the fact that the extension from Sarnia will carry only a limited amount of oil, then I think the suggestion that has been made by members on this side of the House and by members on the government side as well that we should build the short pipeline from Sarnia and then start work on a northern pipeline should be adopted.

I see you are about to rise, Mr. Speaker, so may I have the permission of the House to finish my few remarks? I shall take only a few minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Douglas:** I have dealt with the matter of price and with the matter of the pipeline. The third thing I want to say is that I was hoping that at some time in this debate, but before the House adjourns, we will get a statement from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on what the government's policy is respecting the development of Canada's oil resources so that the crisis we are now facing will be resolved in the long term.

I was appalled to read in this morning's *Globe and Mail* a statement attributed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). In the course of accepting President Nixon's invitation to a conference on energy in Washington on February 11, the Secretary of State for External Affairs is quoted as saying that Canada has already extended an invitation to the United States to invest money in the development of the Alberta oil sands. I do not know whether that is government policy. It certainly has never been stated in this House as government policy. We in this party will want to know from the government whether or not it is government policy—and if the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is going to close the debate I hope he will tell us whether or not it is government policy.

However, there is no need to invite the United States or any other country to develop our oil sands. There will be sufficient financial return to the federal and oil producing provinces from the export tax and other charges to construct plants at a sufficient rate to develop the oil sands and to have oil onstream from the oil sands by the time our conventional oil resources are depleted.

These are the questions that disturb us, Mr. Speaker. We support the bill because it is necessary to have this power to deal with an emergency. But let no one deceive himself that the bill we are now about to pass will resolve the basic and fundamental problems that face this country with respect to the oil crisis. Those problems still have to be faced. We hope that when the House reassembles the government will bring down legislation to deal with the three points I have raised, namely, the question of price, the matter of the pipeline and the future development of our resources.

[Mr. Douglas.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Gleave:** On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

• (1600)

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### ADJOURNMENT OF SESSION

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the House was good enough to agree that I be given the opportunity to revert to motions later for the purpose of moving a motion for the adjournment of the session, under certain conditions, until February 26, 1974.

If I may seek the indulgence of the House to make a comment in respect of an understanding which has been reached as to the nature of the debate, or the lack thereof that may follow the putting of the motion, it has been agreed that if there is to be any speech at all it will not exceed ten minutes, and if there is to be more than one speech there will not be more than one by each party. I hope we will not have any speeches, but if any do take place they should not exceed ten minutes in length and should not exceed four in number. With the agreement of the House in that respect, I would put the motion.

Perhaps on the same point, as to the arrangements which have been made, I might mention that we have had discussions on a number of bills which have not been completed, and it might be the wish of the House to agree that the CNR financing bill and the parks' bill be reinstated at the report stage during the next session, at which point they now stand. This could be done by consent. With those understanding, Mr. Speaker, I would move the motion as follows—

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, may I just say, in respect of the understanding, that the minister is quite right. We in this party feel we should have about ten minutes, whether there are one or two speeches, to put forward our point of view regarding some of the matters that will be lost on the order paper and which cannot be reinstated but in respect of which there has been considerable work carried out. With about ten minutes for one or two short speeches, we are satisfied with the arrangement.

**Mr. Barnett:** Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the minister is seeking the consent of the House to an agreement, or an order that there be no more than one speaker from each party. He did make reference in his preliminary remarks to the reinstatement of certain bills. I listened to the minister rather carefully. It might have assisted my posi-