

interfere with management. British Petroleum was a corporation which could operate on its own designs and make its own plans for the future, even though voting stock control was held by the United Kingdom. Such has not been the case with Crown corporations in this nation, and we can never hope that such will be the case under a government like the one on your right, Mr. Speaker.

Let us go one step further. Not only did they sell shares in British Petroleum, but an announcement appeared in the press that they needed five million pounds for the proper ongoing development of the Crown corporation which was exploring, owning and trying to deliver oil to the United Kingdom from the North Sea. The Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom decided in his wisdom that there was no way that the taxpayer, the credit of the United Kingdom or any other source of funds could finance that work under a Crown corporation.

The result was that a group of experts, accumulated over a period of years, was going to be disintegrated, fired, because the taxpayer could not finance that national corporation. I ask those on my left to take note of this. Because the taxpayer was not considered capable of financing it, the Crown corporation planned to discard the regulatory, exploratory, developmental capability of the staff that it had accumulated.

● (1700)

That is the history of the great U.K. success in the oil industry. Let us carry this one step further. The government of the United Kingdom—and this takes in both the Conservative and the Labour parties—is finding it might well be desirable to liquidate its ownership of the Crown corporation and allow the private enterprise structure to go forward, who might be able, without burden to the British economy, to finance proper development of North Sea oil. That is the success that the United Kingdom government had, even when they kept hands off management, which this government has never done.

May I now call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): 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 Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—Public Service—Cost of living differentials applicable to airport firemen; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Railways—Request for introduction of VIA Rail legislation; the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Heap)—

Water Pollution

The Economy—Request that Governor of Bank of Canada be instructed to lower interest rates.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

Notices of Motions Nos. 22, 5, and 35 allowed to stand by unanimous consent.

ALICE ARM, B.C.—PERMIT FOR AMAX LIMITED

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena) moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House before March 2, 1981, copies of all correspondence, telegrams or communications exchanged between Mr. John Aird and cabinet ministers and/or their past or present staff regarding the permit for Amax Limited at Alice Arm.

He said: As is usual, Mr. Speaker, today we are debating a motion for the tabling of papers that the government has failed to provide, information that should be generally available to the public, or at least to members of this House.

On January 21 of this year, I placed this motion on the Order Paper asking the government to respond by March 2, 1981. Three weeks after the deadline, the then Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council replied in the House. The parliamentary secretary's reply is on the record and, in my view, is not adequate. I therefore asked that the motion be transferred for debate here today.

Let us take a look at the reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, the parliamentary secretary replied that the Departments of the Environment, Fisheries and Oceans, and Indian Affairs and Northern Development did not have any correspondence, etc., with the elusive Mr. Aird. However, and this is clear to all members of this House, my motion asked for the release of correspondence between any cabinet minister and/or their past or present staff.

The parliamentary secretary has produced a limited reply that avoids all other federal departments, ministers and their staff, past or present. Why was that specifically done, Mr. Speaker? I would like to address myself to that matter today.

I think it is clear that the parliamentary secretary should go back to his office, call or correspond with all the other departments that he has skipped over and ask them whether they have in their possession any correspondence with Mr. Aird regarding the permit for Amax Limited at Alice Arm. Until the parliamentary secretary does that, there will be an