

own money instead of trying to seize through the back door 25 per cent of the holdings of a company which used its own money?

**Mr. Waddell:** Its own money?

**Mr. Taylor:** Then the government simply expropriates or grabs its share and hands it over to Petro-Canada as a gift. Petro-Canada spent no money. All companies should pay taxes and they should be paid on total taxable income. The government decides the deductions. That is done in every other industry. No company should have special favour. All companies should pay their share of running this country, but Petro-Canada is given special consideration. It does not put up any money; it gets all its money from the taxpayers. In addition, Petro-Canada gets an asset on which a company may have spent \$1 million.

What does the record say about Petro-Canada? In the public accounts of Canada we find \$440 million under the heading "capital stock". The figure shown as the total amount invested is \$1.444 billion. But how much of that was given back to the people of Canada? If hon. members look up the answer in the book, they will find that nothing was given back, not one penny. The system is take, take and take.

The socialists can say that the people of Canada have an investment of \$1.444 billion, but let the people try to get one penny of it. The way this is being done now is wrong. There is a better way, the democratic way of doing things.

I urge the government not to carry out this totalitarian way of doing things. If it continues to do that, this government will lose whatever credibility there is left. We are a democratic government. Why do we not get our Crown money through democratic principles, accepted principles, instead of through stealth?

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the specifics of Motion No. 25, I cannot resist the temptation to refer again to certain remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), my very good friend to the left who has participated hard and long in the continuing debate on Bill C-48, mainly as the self-appointed spokesman for the native people of Canada.

**Mr. Waddell:** Someone has to.

**Mr. Nickerson:** That is right. The hon. member suggested that maybe in conjunction with Motion No. 25 we examine certain NDP amendments put forward in the name of the hon. member for Nunatsiak (Mr. Ittinuar). I think that is a very good idea. As I understand it from the press, we will not be in a position to read NDP amendments put forward by the hon. member for Nunatsiak in time to come. As I understand it, very shortly the Liberal Party's loss will be the New Democratic Party's gain. What the member is waiting for is an offer to join the cabinet. Judging by the quality of the people already serving in the cabinet, that move would not make that much difference.

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

My intention at the present time is to keep my remarks to the specifics, the rather limited scope of Motion No. 25, which addresses itself to the time at which the election should be made whether or not to transfer Crown interest into a Crown corporation. Clause 31 of Bill C-48 says that this transfer should take place prior to the authorization of the system for producing oil or gas from any Canada lands, etc. Our amendment would change that to read that "the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, prior to the commencement of the terms of an exploration agreement for relevant Canada lands, may direct that the Crown share be transferred to a designated Crown corporation."

I submit that there is a vast difference between those two views, or those times at which the election should occur.

In speaking to this, I would like to refer to the practice in the province of Saskatchewan. This province has a philosophy not dissimilar to that of my friends opposite and to that of my friends to the left. They, however, seem to address the problem in a more responsible manner. When dispositions of mineral rights are made within the province of Saskatchewan, the Crown, in right of that province, can elect to take a share in those particular mineral rights. They do it at the time of the initial exploration. They do not wait until a uranium deposit or some other deposit of minerals has been proven and then come in and take it over. They do it in a gentlemanly manner, as far as possible, for the government of Saskatchewan, and in the businesslike way of getting in on the ground floor.

● (1610)

If you are going to be fair with people and honest with business in the exploration field, surely that is the time when the election must be made. I do not believe it is fair to wait until the work has been done, the gamble made and paid off and then jump in. When a prospect is first granted under the terms of an exploration agreement, the Crown and the geologists within Petro-Canada should make an assessment at that time of whether or not they want to participate. If they do, that is a good time to get in on the ground floor, when the initial expenditures are minimal. If they do not wish to participate, then not much has been lost by the Crown.

I submit that participation at this early stage would have good effects because it would prevent Petro-Canada from acquiring the exploration rights to so great an area that it would not know what to do with it. The hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) spoke to this last evening. He cited the number of acres which would come under the control of Petro-Canada. It would be a phenomenal amount of ground. Petro-Canada's resources would be spread too thin to be able to work that area properly and put sufficient exploration money into it. If it had to be selective at the beginning of the venture and if it had the proper expertise on staff to select the most favourable areas, it should be able to work in partnership with the private partners in that particular exploration agreement to the benefit of all concerned.

I hope that hon. members on the other side would think a little and take note of what happens in the province of Sas-