

minister answer in what time-frame he is trying to achieve this? Is it related to the phasing out of the incentives?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, the objective of the government is to reduce foreign ownership to less than 50 per cent in the industry as an aggregate. We do not foresee, for instance, the elimination of any oil or gas company in Canada that would be more than 50 per cent owned. But what we are concerned about is that overall there would be at least 50 per cent Canadian ownership, and that in the larger companies there would be a significant increase in Canadian controlled companies, that is, companies actually managed and controlled by Canadians. This is a very strong part of our policy and we have announced a number of steps to achieve it.

As far as Canadian ownership is concerned, we have indicated that it will be before 1990 and we have announced steps that I hope will achieve this objective well within this decade. We have not set a specific year within the decade, but we want to make sure that by 1990, at least, this objective will have been achieved, while the other objectives I have mentioned—greater control and a few acquisitions by the Government of Canada—are to be achieved in the early part of this decade.

As to the second part of the question asked by the hon. member with regard to the phasing out of some of the incentives, these are spelled out in detail in "The National Energy Program", and I would refer him to the tables published with that program.

Mr. Wilson: Madam Speaker, I am aware of the phasing out of incentives. It is the concern I have which prompts the question. The primary objective, as stated by the government, was to achieve self-sufficiency during this period of time. Since the foreign-owned companies are a major element in achieving self-sufficiency, my question to the minister is this. Since the incentives for the foreign-owned companies—those companies which own more than 50 per cent offshore—are phased out, is there any intention of introducing at some time within the next ten-year period a change in the incentives to give encouragement to companies which bring in some degree of Canadian ownership but not the full 50 per cent, which would qualify them for the incentives?

Mr. Lalonde: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his supplementary question. The phasing out of the incentives to the foreign-owned companies was put in the energy program to allow those companies to turn around and find Canadian partners and to bring Canadian ownership into their companies as they exist at the present time. We believe that the time lag we have provided for should allow those companies that want to achieve Canadian ownership. For those not wanting to open their companies to Canadians, we have stated that we are ready to buy them out. We will ensure that they will continue to work for Canada in order to achieve our self-sufficiency goal.

Our purpose is not to drive out all foreign companies by any means. As a matter of fact, and as the hon. member knows,

Point of Order—Mr. Johnston

the incentives for tar sands and heavy oil continue, including incentives for foreign companies. There are still incentives for foreign companies, but we would like them to concentrate their efforts in areas where there is most need to help us meet our goal of self-sufficiency.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MOTION UNDER S.O. 43 MOVED BY MR. SIDDON

Madam Speaker: I have received notice of a question of privilege from the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton). I see the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston) rising on a point of order.

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, Standing Order 43 is to be used for matters of urgent and pressing necessity and is to be based on facts. The hon. member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon), dealing with the use of pension funds, suggested that the government was plundering these pension funds. He made allegations intended, I suggest, to frighten public service employees. These allegations are not based on any facts whatever. He made references to figures set forth in the statement by the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) with regard to the financial position taken over a multi-year perspective, which is the same as that in last December's statement by the then minister of finance. If this had been a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, I suggest the hon. member should have raised it at that time.

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Madam Speaker, I have been raising questions with respect to the state of the public service superannuation accounts with this minister, in committee and in this House, for several months. I have not been getting any answers. Therefore it has become a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Madam Speaker: I understand the two hon. members do not have the same interpretation of these facts. Each is entitled to expose them as he sees fit. That is why we have debate in the House of Commons so facts can be refuted from time to time.

As I was saying before that point of order was raised, I have a notice of a question of privilege by the hon. member for Skeena. I require an hour's notice for questions of privilege, and I have not had quite that hour's notice. However, I could close my eyes to that. But when there is notice, if the hon. member looks at the Standing Order, he will see that he should give me a brief statement as to what his question of privilege is all about. He did not do that. The idea is to save the time of the House so that the Speaker, in advance, can look into the situation to be evoked during the course of the question of privilege.

Since the question of privilege does not flow from the deliberations of the House today, I will take his notice now, and ask him to raise it tomorrow.