

negotiated union and labour contracts. He knows the difference between "may" and "shall". He knows it as well as I do. That sophomoric, phony attempt of his to say that "may" is the same as "shall" leaves me breathless. I can scarcely believe the evidence of my senses when I hear a man who is so expert try to flog that suggestion past the members of this House.

I could refer to the excellent grammarian across the way who masquerades under the title of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald). He knows the difference between "may" and "shall". I have heard him expound on the difference many times, both across the bargaining table and at arbitration hearings before conciliation boards. He never backed down from the fact that "may" is permissive and "shall" is mandatory. He knows that. He should not now come before this House and tell us that is not the case.

Mr. Baldwin: He says "shall" to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau); that we know.

Mr. Reilly: I am even more at a loss to understand why the hon. member for York South and his followers would object to all of the legal protection which this parliament can write into a bill like this. They know full well the totalitarian and repressive measures of which this government is capable. Surely they can remember what happened in October, 1970.

An hon. Member: Here we go again.

Mr. Reilly: You bet here we go again. You people will not forget that as long as I have breath in me. They apprehended an emergency then. They brought in their legislation. They tossed hundreds of people in jail. It all turned out to be hot air.

I cannot tell whether there is in fact an oil emergency right now. Neither can the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources tell us that. This government has been in office for ten years. All of a sudden within the past few months there is an emergency. From where did the emergency spring? All of a sudden we are running out of oil. On what date was that discovered? Did someone come in out of the west and say "Pssst; we are running out of oil"? If there had been any planning, the government would have known years ago that we were running out of oil. However, all of a sudden we have an emergency.

We now have before us a bill which gives to the government of Canada and, more specifically, to non-governmental bodies, dictatorial powers. What my colleague from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) seeks to do is provide an appeal procedure from the decisions of the tribunal. What do we get but impassioned oratory from the so-called champions of liberty, simply because there is an outside possibility that one of the best beneficiaries of this appeal procedure might be a corporation? Are corporations not entitled to equal treatment before the law? I do not have any shares in anything, but I still believe that a corporation is entitled to equal treatment before the law.

It is all very well for NDP members to sneer at members of my party, call them mouthpieces of multinational corporations, talk about getting the news from the wellhead, and all that guff. If I wanted to indulge in that kind of

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

petty billingsgate, I could call each one of them a mouthpiece for the American dominated multinational unions. But I would not do that because I do not consider it parliamentary language.

I say to the members of the NDP and the government that there is no harm in this amendment. It does not change anything in this bill. The only thing it does is legislate in favour of people who might conceivably suffer by the application of this potentially dictatorial act. Why should anyone object to it? I am not going to wait until I hear an explanation of that which satisfies me; I very seriously doubt it will be forthcoming from either the opposite side of the House or the nethermost corner occupied by the so-called champions of the people.

Mr. Balfour: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would respond to a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member is seeking the floor for the purpose of asking a question. The minister does not have the floor to answer a question. As the hon. member has already spoken, he cannot seek the floor unless it is to ask a question of the member who has the floor. I must remind him we are not going through the procedure of committee of the whole, where it is easier to ask questions. When we proceed with the Speaker in the chair, this kind of procedure cannot be followed.

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, you will be delighted to know I will not be very long. I first wish to make a few references to the comments made earlier by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). It is my belief that the hon. member for York South and some of his colleagues have almost a psychopathic thing about multinational corporations; they seem to have it on the brain.

Mr. Lewis: If I am going to be psychopathic, that is where I want it to be.

Mr. Lawrence: The hon. member for York South is now indicating his concurrence in what I am saying in respect of his attitude. I think this properly reflects his ideas. Obviously, I am not in any way misinterpreting his words or the intent, view and attitude of all his colleagues in this debate. I am very hesitant to say that the hon. member may be right, because that could be misinterpreted to mean it is mandatory and not permissive.

● (2250)

I must admit I share some of the hon. member's misgivings about multinational corporations. I share some of his suspicions and, along with the hon. member, I regard with anxiety the growing amassment of power by these corporations. And there are many of us on this side of the House who share the hon. member's suspicions. I would point out, however, that in the testimony given before the standing committee, the representatives of these large corporations indicated that they agreed with the intent of the bill before us; that not only did they want the bill but that some of them had exerted pressure on the government to bring such a measure forward. It is obvious why they would. It will, in many ways, continue the trend toward