

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

bill to make it acceptable. Particularly I hope he will give serious consideration to not locking the government or Parliament into a 25 per cent take in both forward and retroactive legislation. I hope the government gives itself some leeway in terms of the ownership share claimed when in fact a find is made. If the government wants money, it can always change the royalty structure, which is not very excessive in the bill. It can always change its taxation system. There is no need to become a 25 per cent government owner of a Canadian company, particularly a small Canadian company.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Before recognizing the hon. member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson), I should like to deal with the late show for this evening.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Ellis)—Air Safety—Request for tabling of reports on emergency locator transmitters; the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain)—VIA Rail—Cuts in service in New Brunswick; the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan)—Regional Development—Elimination of Prince Edward Island public service positions, (b) Administration of federally funded programs.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-48, to regulate oil and gas interest in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, and Motion No. 23 (Mr. Wilson).

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Nickerson:** I do not really know what the applause is for, because I will make a rather brief speech.

**Some hon. Members:** That is why!

**Mr. Nickerson:** I will not wave my arms around as I have done on occasion in the past. I will speak briefly to the fundamentals of Motion No. 23 which is before us. Then I would like to say a little about what I consider to be a rather frightening matter—the way Petro-Canada could influence and affect government in those areas of northern Canada within which it will be exploiting resources.

I should like to keep to the exact motion before us. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) when he spoke on this matter the other day. He certainly did not draw himself back from going on at considerable length and waving his arms. But he pretended that he could not see the difference between this motion and the clause in the bill proposed by the Liberal government. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is one of the few members of the New Democratic Party who is, at least, semi-literate. He can read for himself and find out exactly where the difference lies. In the case of the proposal put forward by the government, it would exempt from the 25 per cent Crown share only those prior leases upon which production has been established, whereas our motion would expand that provision to include those prior leases upon which significant discoveries had been made.

● (1700)

We must remember that in both circumstances we are dealing with a limited number of properties. If we were only to include those properties on which production had commenced, the only one that immediately springs to mind, with the exception of Kotaneelee, which I will get back to later, are the Norman Wells oil field and the Pointed Mountain gas field.

As we all know, the government already has a 30 per cent share in the Norman Wells oil field so it is not necessary to take an additional 25 per cent. That particular clause is redundant as it affects the Norman Wells field.

If we were to list the number of significant discoveries, we would find that the list is fairly limited. Those cases where it might be difficult to determine whether a significant discovery had been made could be dealt with in the normal course of dialogue between the companies and the people in the employ of the Government of Canada. It is not a matter of dealing with several hundred separate properties but, rather, only one or two.

The real reason we proposed this amendment is that, the way the bill stands now, people will be cheated. They have invested time, effort and money in the search for oil and gas in northern Canada and offshore Canada under a certain set of rules and regulations. They thought they could abide by the word of the government. We could get into an argument about whether the terms under which leases were granted were overgenerous, but I think that is largely beside the point now. Those were the rules as determined by the Government of