

and petrochemical products and we cannot ensure that projected Canadian needs will be met. It is also safe to say that for the first time Canadians are paying attention to the ecology of their land and to the advisability or inadvisability of drilling wells in sites of aesthetic value.

Our population has suddenly decided, the young people in particular, that merely because a company wants to drill a well is not sufficient reason for drilling the well. Before the company drills, it should consider the ecology of the area, its aesthetic value and all those who will be using the area for other than oil-producing purposes. No longer will an oil well be drilled in the middle of a community simply because a company wants to drill it. The area I represent does not worry so much about oil wells as about headframes. There are headframes in all sorts of places because mines close down and other industries do not replace them. The usefulness of headframes is limited, I suppose, to anybody who wishes to open a new mine in the area. In the early days headframes were located wherever anyone wanted to locate them. The town, the streets and everything else was built around them. Oil companies believe they have the right to do as they like to the environment and the community in which they operate because they are the main employer and sustain the local economy.

● (5:50 p.m.)

There has been a recent development, particularly with regard to the young people, whereby people feel that making money and having a wealthy company producing revenue by getting more oil out of the ground is not the prime but only one of the considerations involved. The previous speaker said that the lack of desire to drill in many areas should be encouraged. We must take into consideration the Canadian interest rather than playing around with the proposition of drilling a well every so often regardless of the situation.

More than one million acres of land on Vancouver Island are under the control of this company. I do not know the total acreage of Vancouver Island. I am not sure whether they are referring to gross or net acres. In fact, I do not know the difference between a gross and a net acre. Both are referred to in some oil contracts: companies talk about owning 71 million gross acres or 22 million net acres. If any drilling is done near the shores of Vancouver Island, the problems which we are discussing with the United States will occur in that area.

The public has an interest in this matter. It must be assured that its interest is given due consideration by corporations which we set up. If it is a foreign-owned corporation, we will not have very many opportunities to protect the public interest. Our experience in other industrial fields has been that when a company is under the jurisdiction of two countries one of which is the United States, there is very little doubt about which interest will be served: it will always be the American interest. We will not be able to exercise jurisdiction over that company.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Private Bills

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): I realize there are only five minutes left, Mr. Speaker. I wish to put on record some of my observations with regard to the bill before us. I congratulate the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Harries) for his imaginative speech, which I read in *Senate Debates* for March 23. It is just as easy to repeat the remarks made then as to make a new speech in this chamber.

I think all hon. members agree that we should have Canadian ownership and participation. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is well-known to members of this House and to the people of Canada. Canadian Pacific Railway was the main driving force in creating some of the subsidiaries and conglomerates which are now under its control. I suggest that some of the non-rail profits should be taken into consideration when Canadian Pacific Railway makes application for rail line abandonments which are invariably approved by the Canadian Transport Commission.

It is not fair to the people of Canada to pass a bill without ensuring that a commitment is obtained from the parent company that it will meet the original obligation and charter which it was given. We should not pass this bill without asking the company for an assurance that it will try to give Canada the service to which it is entitled, and meet the obligation which it has had since it was incorporated and granted vast tracts of land and moneys.

A United States Senator said as follows:

Montana Senator Lee Metcalf insists that Congress should consider non-railroad income of carriers if it decides to inaugurate operational subsidies.

I suggest that we have operational subsidies in one area of railroad operation. If we look at the over-all operation of this company we will see that the subsidies are not given any consideration. I quote:

Metcalf said in September, 1969, before the ICC: "The question of a carrier's non-rail income as part of its entire total financial position is pertinent to any discussion of our government's transportation policy, and more particularly so if the carrier happens also to be a conglomerate."

The bill before us puts Canadian Pacific Railway in the position of being a conglomerate. We should consider the non-rail operational income of this company and its over-all structure.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. It being six o'clock, this House will rise until eight o'clock this evening.

I was in deep reflection today about man's share of wealth and honour for the work he has done on earth. I came across these lines:

How seldom, friend, a good, great man inherits honour or wealth, with all his worth and pains. It sounds like stories from the land of spirits, if any man obtains that which he merits or merits that which he obtains.

At six o'clock the House took recess.