

● (1710)

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that a motion in similar terms was put forward by the hon. member last year and, as a result of it or of the discussion in the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, that motion having been passed by House and sent to the committee, the government has brought forward Bill C-52 which will be discussed in due course. I think some of the problems and suggestions raised by the hon. member will be discussed in further detail, and perhaps even within a legislative framework which might see this matter come forward in law at a later date.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I now seek consent of the House to withdraw the motion?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) have unanimous consent to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Usually at this point the suggestion is made that we call it six o'clock and I suspect that suggestion will be forthcoming and will probably be agreed to once more. I simply make the point that we have done this three or four times during this session by agreement, but one thing that happens is we find ourselves using up the 40 hours we are allowed on Mondays and Tuesdays for private members' business. I would suggest, since we may now be rising at 5.15 p.m., that this day not count as the 29th hour under the rule under which we have these private members' hours on Mondays and Tuesdays. There has been some discussion about this and I believe, Mr. Speaker, you will find there is agreement.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion just made. Is it agreed by unanimous consent that this hour not be counted in the 40 hours allotted to private members?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Reid: Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it also agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, in part, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At 5.15 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Petro-Canada

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PETRO-CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH CROWN CORPORATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-8, to establish a national petroleum company, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, probably one of the most difficult tasks that I have undertaken since coming to the House of Commons is the one that faces me at present when I say that the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) has been a disaster and is leading all Canadians on a disastrous course. This is a great misfortune.

We are not making these statements so that some time in the future we can say "we told you so," because by then it will be too late. What we are doing now is telling the Canadian people exactly what is happening, so that instead of saying "we told you so" we can say "we are telling you now".

The problem started some time ago. There is no necessity for the confrontation that has taken place between the industry—when I say industry I mean all segments of the oil and petroleum industry—the producing provinces—and when I say producing provinces, I mean British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan—and the federal government. It would not be so bad if it were kept at that level, but it is not. It has now infiltrated down to a great many people in Canada. It is a great misfortune that there has not been a spirit of consultation rather than the confrontation that has taken place. If there had been more consultation we would not necessarily now be debating the bill that is before us.

I lay the whole blame at the feet of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources because he is the one who is in a position to do something about it. I should like to put on record a question and answer as recorded in *Hansard* of September 21, 1973, at page 6794. This is a question that I put to the minister with regard to his dealings with the province of Alberta. I said:

Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the letter to Premier Lougheed of Alberta which was tabled in the House on March 10, 1972, by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources stating in part that "it is of paramount importance that the relationship of the Government of Canada to the government of Alberta in energy policy matters be one of co-operation and collaboration", I should like to ask the minister why that assurance was not honoured?

The minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the hon. gentleman that, given the time constraint in which this decision has to be made, it was honoured to the best of our ability. In particular, with regard to the decision of the National Energy Board on September 12 concerning export of oil to the United States, we had really only a period of overnight to make that decision. We discussed it with the Alberta minister, who was present in Ottawa the following day, just as soon as the cabinet decision had been made.