

by keeping the child beyond the stated period in which visitation is permitted.

● (1800)

Section 250.1(a) is designated to meet the situation where the removal of the child occurs after marriage breakdown contrary to a formal order by removing the child from the established custodial parent or by keeping the child beyond the stated period in which visitation is permitted. Thus, a detention of the child beyond the time permitted in the access provisions of a court custody order would be a specific offence. Likewise, detention of a child beyond the time permitted would be an offence without a court order where there is intent to deprive the other parent of possession of the child. Refusal to give the child up for access would also be an offence under section 250.1(a) or section 250.1(b) depending on whether the access is exercised pursuant to the terms of the court order or pursuant to a *de facto* arrangement.

Mr. Knowles: Question!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. It being six o'clock and the hour allotted for private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6.03 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde 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 second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When the debate was interrupted at five o'clock the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Lang) had the floor.

Mr. Peter Lang (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, when debate on this motion ended at five o'clock, I had given the majority of my speech and my thoughts on this topic. I had covered the purpose of the new legislation, Bill C-48, and had discussed some of its main elements. I would just like to round it out a little bit. I see there are seven members of the loyal opposition present, including—

Canada Oil and Gas Act

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is wise for a member to start commenting on how many members there are in the House of Commons—

Mr. Knowles: Especially when there are only ten Liberals.

Mr. Paproski: Not only that. There are committees meeting and other places where members meet in the evening. That is something this young member should be aware of.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With due respect, this appears to be a routine that the House might better avoid on future occasions.

● (2010)

Mr. Lang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was about to say that I noticed the former minister of finance, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) was here. I am glad he is here to participate in this debate. The energy critic for the Conservative party is here and I am glad to see his attendance during this very important debate.

In many ways this debate has followed a predictable course. On the one side, members of the NDP have been saying to the government it is not doing enough; we need more government intervention so we should nationalize industry. The position the New Democratic Party has taken on this question, as on many others, would leave our economy and our deficit in such bad shape there would be no way we could support the social programs the New Democratic Party is so fond of trying to take credit for.

Mr. Knowles: You read that part before five o'clock.

Mr. Lang: Members of the New Democratic Party are very fond of trying to take credit for these social programs.

Mr. Knowles: You read that before five o'clock. We have already heard it.

Mr. Lang: In response to the hon. member let me say that I think it is worth while repeating. Members of the New Democratic Party have been trying to take credit for many of the programs previous Liberal governments have put forward. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of our social programs have been put forward by Liberal governments. I think it is important, with all due respect to the hon. House leader of the New Democratic Party, that we discuss this and bring this fact to bear.

We have seen some facts brought forward by members of the Conservative party which suggest members of that party take the side of the little guy. The posturing of the Conservative party with regard to their rhetoric of concern for the little guy I find difficult to understand, particularly in view of the fact that one year ago last Thursday the same group of members put forward a budget which contained no social measures and no social concern at all. If they are so concerned about the little guy then why did that Conservative government introduce a budget that would have cost the consumer \$40 billion more than will the Liberal budget and its energy policy?