

monetary market. Among the worst of the gnomes of Zurich actually are these world wide corporations which use the international money market for the purpose of additional profits by buying and selling futures and speculating, not in terms of buying actual dollars but in the way in which they handle the product they sell across the world. It is this kind of concentrated power with immense social consequences that we are now allowing to control yet another basic resource of the Canadian people.

I believe that anyone who thinks about Canada's independence at all, or anyone who is concerned about the future of this country and its ability to gain sufficient economic, political and social independence to build its own distinct society, must be concerned about the deal that has now been announced by the premier of Alberta. That he made such a deal I am not surprised. I am not surprised that a leader of the Conservative party would think that was the right kind of deal to make, because that is quite natural with the particular social philosophy of that party. However, I think the people of Canada ought to recognize it for what it is. I believe it is the duty of the federal government, which is necessarily, or ought to be, concerned with the entire problem of national energy and a national energy policy, to look into this aspect of foreign ownership to see whether or not the investment bill which has left the committee is sufficiently wide to cover this kind of arrangement.

● (1410)

Above all, Mr. Speaker, and I say this with emphasis even though I may not raise my voice, we do not see any reason at all why the federal government, either through the CDC or directly through public investment at this end, should not in that way make certain that at least the control of the Athabasca tar sands development will be in Canadian hands.

**Mr. Paproski:** In the hands of Alberta.

**Mr. Lewis:** We ask the government of Canada to look at that, in partnership with the government of Alberta—let me say to the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski)—and in partnership to some extent with the corporations now involved. I am not suggesting that either one of those be excluded, but instead of 80 per cent being in the hands of private, foreign-owned corporations, at least 51 per cent ought to be in the hands of the provincial and federal governments of Canada so that we can control our own future.

We want to know how that involvement will take place. When we return on October 15 we want to know from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources whether the export tax is the only step he will take with regard to assuring orderly marketing of petroleum products in Canada, or whether he will also go ahead with the national marketing board. I plead with him to do so. I plead with him that that is the one way to assure supplies to the Canadian people, to place the supplying of Canadian needs in priority over exports. We ought not to be worrying every second day about exports to the United States.

We ought to have a distinct policy, which the Americans and everybody else in the world can understand, that we are determined that Canadian needs for oil products and

### *Adjournment*

natural gas will be a priority for the oil products and natural gas that the Canadian people now have at their disposal. We suggest that this can only be done through a national marketing board, through a Canadian petroleum corporation, and we want to know what the government's ideas are on these things.

When we get back on October 15 I hope the government will lose no time in referring the election expenses bill to the appropriate parliamentary committee. It has been lying there ever since it was passed on second reading quite a number of weeks ago. In my opinion, and in the opinion of my colleagues, it is a very important piece of legislation, one of the very best pieces of legislation in that area that has been suggested in Canada to date. Many hon. members have expressed their wish that it be passed and, as I say, I hope the government will lose no time in referring it to the committee.

When we compare this election expenses bill with the bill that we were presented with in the last parliament we see that the differences are immense. It was the same President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), Sir, who presented the bill in the last parliament and presented the bill in this parliament. The bills are so different that I am certain the same man is different. There has been some real change in the minister and in the government. I do not suppose it takes much genius to think that the results of October 30 had something to do with the great change, moral, social, spiritual, and above all political, that has taken place in the ranks of the government.

We were glad to see on the order paper the bill for the new family allowance plan, and I was personally delighted to read in the press of the family allowance program announced by the Premier of the province of Quebec. We think we and the other Canadian parliaments are doing the right thing by the families of Canada, particularly in a rising cost of living situation. I hope we will not lose time in putting that bill into law, so that the families of Canada who have children will be guaranteed the assistance which it will provide for them.

Finally I hope that when we return on October 15 we will not lose much time in receiving the amendments to the Canada Pension Plan from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) which we have been promised, amendments not only to remove the 2 per cent limit on escalation but also to increase the ceiling on allowable earnings under that plan. Even more important I hope that parliament, the government, the official opposition, we in the New Democratic Party, and the Social Crediters, will have the wisdom and vision to insist on lowering the pensionable age both for the old age security pension and for the Canada Pension Plan. There are many spouses whose husbands have taken pensions but who themselves are not yet of pensionable age, and as a result these people are living in a type of degradation that our country ought not to allow.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there are these areas of action that can be effective. They are not simplistic slogans about dealing with the cost of living such as have been presented to us, and about which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and his deskmate, the hon. member for Peace River have boasted. I have said what I think about that plan on numerous occasions. But there are areas of price