

Canada Oil and Gas Act

tously gave by way of development incentives and depletion allowances to the industry over the years. But the means by which those interests are being reclaimed by the government are totally dishonest and immoral, as my colleague from Etobicoke Centre pointed out. The government's approach represents the breaking of a firm contract and as such it is an aspect of lack of trustworthiness which must make private industries in this country, not just the petroleum industry, shudder each night with anticipation of where this trend toward nationalization is leading our country.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there is little indication either in the government's energy program, the budget or this bill that the government has taken a co-operative approach with the industry in coming to grips with some of the quantitative questions which underlie the philosophy of this bill. I refer to a couple of quotes from the budget document. In the first paragraph on page nine of the October 28 budget speech the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) said:

In the absence of changes in the fiscal regime, rising prices for oil and gas would generate inappropriate balance between governments.

Further down that page, in the fourth paragraph, the Minister of Finance said:

The federal taxes reflect the capacity of the oil and gas industry to pay and bring its contributions more closely into line with what other industries are required to pay.

I submit the government has presented not one tot of evidence which shows that profits are excessive in relation to the risk which is required to develop petroleum resources in this country. It is most untimely and improper of this government to take a position of distrust toward the petroleum industries of Canada and, indeed, to refuse to co-operate with them in seeking their guidance and consulting with them as to their operating economics before producing a piece of legislation such as this bill.

Third, Mr. Speaker, in the area of consultation, it seems a travesty to me that experts within the industry are held in an atmosphere of mistrust rather than in an atmosphere of confidence as being able to provide insights, knowledge and experience, which government bureaucrats in Ottawa definitely lack.

This leads to another of my concerns, the lack of realism on the part of the government opposite and its bureaucratic socialistic advisers—lack of realism in the department, because they do not sit down and total the figures and consider that in the national interests of developing our much-needed high risk resources in the offshore and frontier areas, we must have competition and reward risk with a proper return on investment.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker? I would like to resume my remarks tomorrow.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS— POLICY OF DEPARTMENT

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, on December 10 in response to a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) concerning the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts), who also serves as the Minister of State for Science and Technology, the parliamentary secretary pointed out a few things which are not usual in this House. I am not sure who will respond this evening, as I do not see either the Minister of the Environment or his parliamentary secretary in the chamber, but I would like to relate to the House exactly what did take place.

I quoted from a news release dated November 17 put out by the Department of the Environment which stated in part:

Mr. Roberts pointed out that Canada faces a similar energy dilemma to that of the United States. "We, like our neighbours to the south, have to achieve energy self-sufficiency," he said. "We too are looking for alternatives to our dependence on foreign oil which will involve increasing our use of domestic coal. However, we are going to develop these alternatives in an environmentally sound manner. The political will to do this in Canada is strong and we must demonstrate this to the United States".

Subsequent to that, I moved a motion under Standing Order 43 which in effect supported the Minister of the Environment's statement of November 17. I asked this House and members of the opposition to support the minister in his statement that we have an environmentally sound program developed for the future of the nation. My motion asked the House to express unanimous support for the principle stated, when referring to Canada's increasing use of domestic coal in an environmentally sound manner, that the political will to do this in Canada is strong and that we must demonstrate this. Those were the words of the Minister of the Environment.

I was asking for unanimous support for the minister by having this principle adopted. The motion was put according to the provisions of Standing Order 43 and was turned down. However, it was not turned down by any members on this side of the House, but by members of the government and supporters of the Liberal government, the Minister of the Environment's own colleagues. I find it rather astounding, that a minister responsible for two very important portfolios would be repudiated by his own colleague. That is a shame because in this particular instance what the minister was attempting to do was in the best interests of the nation.

It is unfortunate that the minister does not have the support of his colleagues. It is incredible that a minister of the Crown would continue to occupy a seat on the front benches of the Government of Canada without the support of his caucus