

Mr. Paproski: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that, and I do not think these innuendoes should be made by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). What I said was that the government had no oil policy.

Mr. Alexander: I heard that.

Mr. Paproski: I do not appreciate what the hon. member for York South has said, and I think he should withdraw that statement.

Mr. Lewis: I thought I heard the hon. member for Edmonton Centre make the kind of interjection which suggested he was not in agreement. I gather from his remarks on his question of privilege that he is in agreement with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain.

Mr. Paproski: Again, I wish the hon. member would withdraw that statement.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: I am not quite sure which statement I am now being asked to withdraw.

Mr. Paproski: Both.

Mr. Lewis: Apparently I am to withdraw both. Well, I cannot. Either the hon. member is in agreement with his hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, or he is not. Assuming he is, the government knows that every member of this House is in agreement with the idea of a national petroleum corporation. If this particular gentleman is not in agreement, I still believe the majority of members in this House are in favour of such a necessary national agency to protect Canadians, and I urge the government to lose no time.

I was also disappointed that the minister should have said nothing about the extension of the pipeline. I agree with the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) that the line ought not to stop in Montreal but that it should go further east. I do not take back what I said in Vancouver. I believe the division of Canada into two markets to protect the oil corporations of this country, introduced by a Tory government in 1961, may have given the people of eastern Canada a slight advantage in price for 10 or 12 years but it has now placed them in a position of danger, a position they would never have occupied had Canadian resources as well as offshore resources been available to them.

I do not accept the proposition that the extension of the pipeline would necessarily have meant large increases in the price to eastern Canadians because obviously what was needed, and has been discussed for years, is a reversible line through which western oil could flow to the east and offshore oil, as it is available, go in the other direction during certain periods, averaging the cost and offering the same price to all Canadians—and a lower price than the multinational corporations are presently imposing.

This is why we support the export tax. Members of the Conservative Party keep railing against the minister for having made Premier Lougheed mad at him. Well, if he did so on the issue of the export tax it is a good issue on

Oil and Gas

which to get him mad, in my submission. What would have been the situation had the export tax not been imposed? I made some calculations myself. It would have meant an extra amount of money, in terms of exports of about 1.2 million barrels a day, of around \$57 million a month to the multinational corporations, of which the Alberta government—one talks about the Alberta people at the moment, so it is the Alberta government and people—would have got about \$13 million.

So \$44 million of the \$57 million a month would have gone into the pockets, already well filled, of the multinational corporations. In the course of a year, the government of Alberta might have received about \$150 million. But the multinational corporations would have got \$533 million. Members of the House who are anxious to give this kind of money to the multinational corporations at the expense of the Canadian people are welcome to continue their catcalls and their defence of their corporate friends in the oil industry. My colleagues and I are glad that our proposal for an export tax has been accepted by the government.

I, personally, believe that the Alberta people should receive more than the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) has suggested. There is no reason why they should not get a very much larger part of the \$1.90 export tax, the remainder being used in the way the government has indicated to help develop new sources of energy for the people of this country.

Let me conclude by saying this: I am convinced there is no reason for the problems which now face the people of Canada in the area of energy and petroleum resources. Our country has enough oil. Our country has enough natural gas. Our country has enough refining facilities or, if it has not, it should have. Our country has sufficient transportation facilities to meet the needs of all the people from our own Canadian resources, should there be difficulty in getting supplies from elsewhere, or, if it does not, it should have.

An hon. Member: So move them out.

Mr. Lewis: Whoever said that, God save this country and the people of this country if these people protecting the oil companies of western Canada were to get their hands on the levers of power at any time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (2200)

Mr. Lewis: The only reason our country is experiencing such major difficulty this winter is that our oil and petroleum resources have been sold out by consecutive federal and provincial governments, particularly the Social Credit and Tory governments of Alberta, to the multinational corporations without concern for the welfare and future of this country. I think that until through this parliament Canadians regain control of the natural resources of this country and take away the power that the multinational corporations now have, periodic crises are bound to continue in the future.

I warn that this winter is not the only winter of crisis in this area. As consumption and demand increases in this country and throughout the world, we will continue to