phase and could not go into that phase, and when we get into that position the state might as well own all the industrial concerns of the country.

I should like to talk for a few moments more about one particular industry. I dealt with it today when I asked a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he said I had made a speech. This is in reference to the petroleum industry. When the Conservative government took office, western Canada was producing about 256,000 barrels of crude petroleum a day and had trouble getting rid of it through domestic consumption and exports. Then, under the national petroleum policy developed by the Conservative government, we were able to build that up to 800,000 barrels per day, and brought millions of dollars into the country from the United States to buy that product. That was done by coming to an agreement with the United States on a quota basis, under which western Canada was given a market in the northwestern United States.

When I asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce about it today he shoved my question off and said it was a speech, but when he answered the hon. member for Acadia yesterday, in regard to the same thing, he said "We had a discussion with the Americans and we are going to have another discussion." Words, Mr. Chairman, will never build industry or trade. We want action. We have heard about 60 days of action, but they have turned into 60 days of marathon talk by the Liberals.

If the petroleum industry loses out in reference to that agreement in western Canada it will mean a great loss not only to western Canada but to Canada generally; because for the first time in a great number of years-I think it was 24 years—we were able to have a balance in trade with the United States so far as dollars were concerned. That occurred under the last Conservative government. When the party opposite talks about industry one would almost think they were the fathers of this thing. Canada, without trade, would fade. We must have trade. Who was it in the province of Alberta who for 20 long years opposed the export of natural gas from that province to the United States?

An hon. Member: The Liberal party.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right. Somebody is good at answering. That same party is now bidding for office in the province of Alberta, but the people remember that it was the Liberal party, even as late as the time of the last provincial election, which opposed the export of gas from the province of Alberta. Yet what a boom it has brought to industry. It was a Conservative government which set up the national energy board and

Establishment of Industry Department

it was a Conservative government which set up the Borden commission from which the national energy board legislation flowed, bringing millions of dollars to western Canada. These were measures the Liberals opposed when in opposition there. I will name some of these people. There is Harper Prowse, the former provincial leader who ran federally but who did not make the grade in western Canada. There is my good friend Grant McEwan who used to lead the Liberal party. He was against gas export.

Mr. Pickersgill: On a point of order. I did not have the opportunity of hearing the first part of Senator Goldwater's—I beg your pardon—of the hon. member for Bow River's speech, but it does seem to me that this is not a place to carry on the Alberta provincial election campaign. We are dealing with the affairs of Canada and with a resolution to precede a bill before this house. Interesting as a political history of Alberta might be—and, incidentally, Alberta has never had a Conservative provincial government in all its history—it is altogether irrelevant to what is before the committee this afternoon.

Mr. Martineau: Might I suggest it would have been more profitable had the Secretary of State been here at the beginning of my hon. friend's speech so that he would know what point the hon. member was making before he butted in.

Mr. Pickersgill: On the point of order, I understand the hon. member was talking about gas, on which subject, I understand, he is a great authority.

Mr. Woolliams: I am always happy to have an interjection from the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. I am disappointed he did not hear my opening remarks because I paid him a great compliment this afternoon. I said he was the greatest backroom boy any political party had ever seen, and the most active frontbencher. Given the combination of those two qualities it is unfortunate his title is not that of Prime Minister, because he certainly guides that party and is the leader of that party.

The Chairman: If the point of order has been settled, we might return to the subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you. I knew you would wish me to answer the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate, Mr. Chairman.

I was speaking about a reduction in taxation and I also mentioned something about socialism. Somebody rose on a point of order, and I said the Liberal party were out-socializing the socialists. Most people remember what happened in Saskatchewan when the socialists set up industry there. They took