

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

**Mr. Elzinga:** I hear some heckling from my friends to the left. As our House leader indicated, they are social parasites. I appreciate the comments made by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) who calls a number of them a red wart on the red rump.

This motion points out clearly the philosophical difference between us in the Conservative party and the Liberal and New Democratic Party coalition, as did the constitutional discussion in the House.

**Mr. Deans:** What has this got to do with the bill?

**Mr. Elzinga:** We believe in the individual worth of Canadians. We believe in the free enterprise philosophy. It is quite obvious the other two parties do not. All we have to do is take a look at their actions. They speak for themselves.

As our spokesman has indicated, basically we support the 50 per cent Canadianization content and ownership. We would encourage Canadian ownership. We would encourage it in a totally different way from what this present administration is doing. There is no finer example to illustrate how we would encourage this than that of Petro-Canada, and what we were going to do with the petroleum company of Canada. We were going to allow individual Canadians an opportunity to participate in the development of their resources by participating directly in the development and in the profits of the company. But our friends opposite and our friends to the left would not allow Canadians that opportunity. They feel they are that much wiser than the individual Canadian.

**Mr. Deans:** They went to the polls and turfed you out.

**Mr. Elzinga:** They feel they should control it rather than individual Canadians.

I have never in my life seen a party more hypocritical than the New Democratic Party.

**Mr. Deans:** Take a look around you.

**Mr. Elzinga:** I wish to share with you some specific examples of hypocrisy.

**Mr. Deans:** You epitomize hypocrisy.

**Mr. Elzinga:** The budget on which we were defeated in 1979—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I recognize that you have endeavoured at great length to offer as broad a latitude as possible to all members of the House in this debate, but the level of slop that is coming from the right at the moment is irrelevant to the taxpayers of this nation. It is particularly irrelevant and hypocritical when we are discussing a bill that is extremely serious. It is improper for members to come into this chamber completely unprepared and to speak in only vaguely relevant terms on the bill. I would request, as a

member of this House, that you give some direction to those speakers who are not even vaguely aware of what Bill C-48 is all about.

**Mr. Elzinga:** Mr. Speaker, what we have heard from the hon. member is typical of that party. They are not happy only dictating to the Canadian people. Now they want to dictate to the supreme being in this House, namely, our Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. I have been offered the opportunity to be the supreme being. I have no choice but to seek recognition. I did not take up the point made by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton). I think he was arguing on a point of order that there ought to be some greater degree of relevance.

**Mr. Andre:** The point of order should be more relevant.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The difficulty is not a new one to either hon. members or to the Chair. As I have done on previous occasions, I would suggest to the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga) that he, as well as other members, may wish to consider the suggestion made by the hon. member for Skeena. That is the best that I can do, other than to make an outright ruling that something is not relevant.

Possibly some of the heated language could be moderated. That would perhaps get us through to ten o'clock, which is not far away.

**Mr. Elzinga:** Mr. Speaker, I should tell hon. members in this chamber that I am dealing with the Canadianization clause and the back-in provisions of 25 per cent ownership, but I have some introductory remarks to lead up to that.

**Mr. Deans:** Not at the report stage, you don't.

**Mr. Elzinga:** As I was saying, I want to deal with the hypocrisy of the party to my left. I could deal with that very quickly by mentioning two items that we had in our budget, namely the energy tax credit and the mortgage deductibility program. We advocated the energy tax credit. Hon. members over there voted against it but now they are shouting to have it included. That illustrates one example of the hypocrisy of my friends opposite.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Elzinga:** We would like nothing better than to have an election now.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Elzinga:** The second example is the mortgage tax credit program. Our friends were shouting that we should do something for the home owners. They had great concern for them. But when they defeated us in this chamber, interest rates were only 14 per cent. These people have contributed to the rise of interest rates by some 6 per cent to 7 per cent. They are directly responsible, as are hon. members opposite. But now they come out with their deep concern for social causes, such as the need to help the home owner. We advocated that help