

cations is concerned, the reply to the above question is as follows:

1. Yes, \$2,800,000 between 1962 and 1964, on condition that the remaining 50 per cent of the estimated construction cost be forthcoming from the provincial governments and the private sector.

2. There is no arrangement for continued funding to the Fathers of Confederation Memorial Citizens' Foundation.

CANADA COUNCIL

Question No. 2,698—**Mr. Young:**

What was the total operating budget for the Canada Council in the fiscal year 1980-81 and what amount was allocated for (a) administrative costs (b) commissions of inquiry into the arts (c) disbursements of grants to artists?

Mr. Jack Masters (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: The Canada Council's total expenditures amounted in 1980-81 to \$52,645 million, not including a \$654,000 item for the operation of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO. These were broken down as follows:

(a) Administration	8,903,000
(b) Commissioned studies	49,000
(c) Grants and services to artists and arts organizations	43,693,000

COMPENSATION FOR PROPERTY SEIZED IN CHINA

Question No. 3,012—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Secretary of State for External Affairs conclude an agreement with the People's Republic of China to compensate certain Canadians for properties seized from Canadian owners after the 1949 revolution and was the total amount of compensation \$340,000?

2. Does the figure of \$340,000 represent a full amount of all claims by Canadians and, if not, what was the full amount and for what reason did the government settle for less?

3. What is the total estimated value of all property and goods lost by Canadians as a result of seizure in China after the 1949 revolution?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes.

2. No. The figure of \$340,000 represents a realistic assessment of compensation obtainable from China for Canadian claims in light of documentary and other evidence surrounding the claims.

3. It is impossible to determine with any exactitude what the total value of all property and goods lost is. The agreement deals only with provable claims of eligible Canadian citizens submitted to the Government of Canada.

[English]

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Canada Oil and Gas Act

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

Hon. Pierre Bussières (for Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-48, to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to speak during the third reading stage of Bill C-48. Indeed, this is something of an historic occasion in that it was a year ago that the National Energy Program was tabled in this House. The bill on which we are now embarking at third reading will put into place significant parts of that total program.

The importance of the bill now before us can hardly be overestimated. It is a key element in the total National Energy Program. The bill provides the essential framework for the careful management and successful development of the tremendous petroleum potential of the Canada lands, those federal lands in the north and offshore.

At the same time, the bill provides for the people of Canada an equitable share in the development of their own petroleum industry while helping to ensure that that development is carried out with the greatest regard for the safety and integrity of the people and environment of the frontier areas.

Debate on this bill both in committee and in this House has been thorough and fruitful. A number of members from both sides of the House have worked hard to bring forward useful suggestions which have been incorporated as amendments in the legislation now before us.

The NEP has come a long way in the past year. There have been disagreements about what we are attempting to do, and we have resolved many of them. As part of the National Energy Program we took a major step forward recently with the conclusion of agreements with the governments of Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan. Those agreements are of great importance because they allow Canadians to get on with the job of creating our energy security. However, they are important for another reason. They show that, despite differences of opinion, two levels of government in Canada can sit