

United States is going to be short 4 million barrels of oil or gas per week, that refining capacity could be found in Canadian refineries. This is particularly true in view of the minister's statement in this chamber this afternoon that the whole of the increase cited by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands was the entire production of eastern refineries, representing only 2 per cent of total Canadian output.

It is staggering to realize that this substantial increase represents only that small percentage of total Canadian production involving only refineries in eastern Canada. If there were greater imposition of controls on crude, we could perhaps employ the additional capacity of western Canadian refineries to our advantage. As stated by the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge, we should carry out more refining of our crude oil in Canada.

I also take issue with the statement that the present government hides behind the National Energy Board. Let me simply reiterate what the minister has already said, that the National Energy Board was constituted by an act of Parliament, with specific powers, and this government has an obligation, until otherwise advised, to give that board its support. Indeed, in view of the way the board has acquitted itself of its obligations in the past, it should be commended.

I should now like to turn to the subject of guidelines referred to by the minister this afternoon. He indicated he was ready, notwithstanding the powers of the National Energy Board in respect of the Mackenzie valley pipeline, to review those guidelines for the board in its determination of the advisability of this pipeline. The minister indicated his willingness to refer the guidelines to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works in order that it might study the problem. I commend the minister for that statement and hasten to add that I am sure hon. members of that committee are ready, able and willing to review these guidelines.

Let me now turn to the comments of the hon. member for York-Simcoe. I take strong issue with the entire content of that hon. member's speech. I have been present during all speeches on this matter and not once did I hear the expression of any anti-American sentiment. Not once was the United States attacked in the House this afternoon, nor was anything said which might lend credence to the thought expressed by the hon. member for York-Simcoe to the effect that the speech of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands was an expression of anti-American sentiment. We have heard this sort of demagoguery before, and I suggest it has no place in this House. Our dealings with our neighbour to the south have always been on friendly terms, and we have always sought to protect our national interests. I fail to see at this time how the comments of the hon. member for York-Simcoe fit that endeavour.

The plea of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) was that we should abandon our partisan stance in order to analyse this very serious problem. He indicated that all parties were very concerned about this problem and were busy studying it, considering its various facets. I suggest that plea was completely neutralized by the attitude of the hon. member for York-Simcoe, expressed in sensational rhetoric. He then pro-

ceeded to use his best efforts and most tortuous logic to protect the interests of big oil companies. All I can say is, bully for him.

Mr. Stevens: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) rises on a point of order.

● (2020)

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we do not have the benefit of today's *Hansard*, but I would remind the hon. member that in moving the motion the statement was made that we do not have a national oil policy, that it is designed by the Americans, that we do not export to the United States but that Canada has been used as a tap by that country.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is not a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is not a point of order. It is a point of debate, and the point of debate has been made.

Mr. Blais: As for the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, as well as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands they made most informative addresses in which they sought to review the past and the reason we are in this particular situation. They sought to offer some solutions. They ought to be commended for that. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands agreed that the solutions proposed are short-term. He was well advised in this regard.

It seems evident from the nature of the solution expressed in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the motion that the hon. member was attempting to engage other hon. members in debate and to seek the ideas of others. Undoubtedly he did not propose those particular solutions as being conclusive, because I am sure if he had known the ultimate conclusions he would not have resorted to the type of motion that he presented. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, in paragraph (A) speaks about the government taking immediate steps to implement the measures he cites. Yet I suggest he has not provided any evidence, with reference to paragraph (a), that there is a direct relationship between the incidence of exports of gasoline and, indeed, the takeover of known reserves in Canada of crude oil. The evidence as adduced by the hon. member in this particular instance is to the contrary. Really, all the gas which has been exported has been exported from refineries in eastern Canada. That oil was offshore oil, in accordance with the Ottawa valley policy adopted by the former government.

In the second step which the hon. member proposes, he states that there should be a two-price system. But he did not indicate, at least to my recollection, what sort of a two-price system he thought should be imposed. Is it a two-price system by way of an increase at the wellhead, with subsidy to the domestic user? That is one solution. Or is it an export tax or export duty imposed by the federal government? That would be another solution. Or, indeed, is it by way of a two-price system established by the Alberta Energy Conservation Board and, if so, what would be the role of the National Energy Board in that case? The