

*Canada-Nova Scotia Oil Agreement*On Clause 92—*Amendment to Access to Information Act*

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Chairman, during the past hour we contacted officials of the Department of Justice. They have reviewed Clause 92 and have informed us that all is in order. The items on the English side of the page are not in the same order as they are on the French side. However, the clause as it stands is ready for passage.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Chairman, we in this Party are prepared to accept that that is what the Parliamentary Secretary was informed by officials of the Department of Justice. However, it still looks to us as if subclause (2) somehow or other contains a great deal more information on the English side than on the French side of the page. We will certainly not become involved in an argument in this Chamber. I do not have the credentials to attest to being an expert on translation, and I do not intend to try to translate it.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Fox (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the Bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to participate for just a minute in that we have spent a good part of today on the Bill. Again I pay tribute to the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia. Upon reading the Bill it is clear that the Premier has driven a hard bargain on behalf of the people of Nova Scotia. I think he deserves credit for that.

Also I should like to repeat some of my introductory thoughts, thoughts which I think were expressed by Hon. Members who spoke on behalf of our Party. There is something very wrong with pieces of legislation and with thought patterns which enable the Government of Canada, in the name of the people of Canada, to confiscate a portion of someone's property without compensation. This is what the back-in provision on Canada lands really represents.

I do not blame the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia. Once the individual landholder has been robbed, then the Premier of Nova Scotia wants a part of the proceeds for the people of Nova Scotia, and that is probably appropriate. However, it is the federal Government which is doing the robbing, and that is inappropriate. I wish we could go back in time, and that the Chamber had reached a different conclusion.

One of the things we do in the House of Commons is pay Ministers an extra amount of money for doing ministerial tasks. Surely it is an insult to the Chamber and to the people of Nova Scotia that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) showed up today for Question Period but has not been with us at any other time during second reading, consideration in Committee of the Whole or now a third reading. It makes one wonder whether or not the

Minister of Energy has earned his paycheque on this day. If there were a way to move a motion to dock the Minister of Energy at least one day's pay, if not one month's pay, I would hope the Chamber would take that action. It is an insult to the Chamber and to the people of Nova Scotia that he cared so little about this agreement that he chose not to be with us at any point in the proceedings.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) on a point of order.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members ought to realize that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) has a host of other duties. If this agreement is adopted in the House today, it is thanks to the fact that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has been giving this matter special attention during the past months, and not to the comments of the Hon. Member opposite—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fox: There is just no comparison. Without the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, there would be no agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall).

[*English*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I wanted to express some appreciation to the Government. I take particular note of the fact that this is just another step in a continuing process which started with the Right Hon. Robert Stanfield, which continued with the Hon. George Isaac Smith when he was Premier of the Province, then with the present Minister for International Trade (Mr. Regan), and in recent years with the Hon. John Buchanan, the present Premier of Nova Scotia. These premiers, together with hundreds of officials, worked diligently to try in a small but very significant way to delineate the areas of jurisdiction and the questions of revenue sharing. This is but another step in that process.

As was pointed out, while the Bill may well be frustrated in the years ahead, nevertheless for Nova Scotians it is a step of some significant note. It is historic in the sense that we now know where we stand. We know now what are the rules of the game and we are prepared to play with those rules.

I suppose it remains only for us to echo our reservations with respect to the back-in provisions. Some of the provisions within the Bill will be deemed to be confiscatory because in fact they are. It was never intended that Nova Scotia would have ownership or control of the feeder lines, the collectors or all pipelines lying offshore. In essence they are the very valuable properties of that section of our life, the private sector which put the dollars into it. The taxpayers have put very little into it.