

Although the hon. member for Hamilton East indicated that he had read the interim report, the Solicitor General indicated in the first instance that he had only shown him that portion which dealt with the wire tapping but later the Solicitor General said he had shown him the report; the answers in *Hansard* yesterday indicate that the Minister of Labour had read the entire report. Was the Solicitor General, or was *Hansard*, incorrect in copying down the Solicitor General in saying he had only shown him that aspect dealing with the taped telephone conversation?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I am sure the hon. member has asked what would have been a very interesting question had it been posed during the question period. However, it does not constitute a point of order.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Baldwin:** Might I ask the House leader, having in mind the tremendous speed with which the House has been processing legislation, what designs he has on the time of the House between now and the date on which the government decides to recess?

**Mr. Sharp:** Today we shall be continuing discussion in committee of the whole on the Petroleum Administration Act and tomorrow the Minister of Finance will take two of his budget bills, perhaps the Excise Tax Act and the customs bill. If we can dispose of them, we shall revert on Monday to consideration of the Petroleum Administration Act. Tuesday is an allotted day and I hope there can be some discussion of the very popular question of conflict of interest. I trust that at the end of the day we can make the reference I have put down of the subject of conflict of interest as it affects members of parliament including cabinet ministers, and public servants to the appropriate committee.

Basically, there remains on our agenda until the time of adjournment for the Christmas recess, the Petroleum Administration Act and, of course, completion of the consideration of certain bills which are now in the standing committees or at various stages. I hope we can complete some of these bills, too.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A week ago today, the hon. gentleman indicated in reply to the third or fourth question on the matter, that we would soon see the bill in the name of the Minister of Transport calling on the railway companies to disclose certain freight rate information. Will we get that bill in 1974?

**Mr. Sharp:** I should not reveal what went on in cabinet today, but there was authorization to proceed with this bill so I expect that within a few days it will be before the House.

## Oil and Petroleum

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION ACT

##### MEASURE RESPECTING THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTERPROVINCIAL, EXPORT AND IMPORT TRADE IN PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, December 4, 1974, consideration in committee of Bill C-32, to impose a charge on the export of crude oil and certain petroleum products, to provide compensation for certain petroleum costs and to regulate the price of Canadian crude oil and natural gas in interprovincial and export trade—Mr. Macdonald (Rose-dale)—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

● (1520)

**The Chairman:** Order, please. When the committee rose last evening it was still considering clause 2 of the bill and the hon. member for Calgary Centre had the floor.

On clause 2—*Definitions*.

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon we were in committee of the whole on Bill C-32 and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, speaking on behalf of this party, outlined the position of our party on this bill. Though it should not need repeating, it evidently does in view of the reaction we have had. Let me make it clear that this party still maintains the position it took in November of last year, namely, that there should be one uniform price for crude oil across Canada. We still take the position that that price should be less than the world price; but we also insist, on legal grounds, ethical grounds and on grounds of maintaining a viable and healthy Canadian unity, that this price and any future increase, as well as the question of revenue sharing, must be resolved by consultation and fair dealing on the part of the federal government and the provincial governments affected. We cannot and we will not accept the kind of confrontation, bad faith and what has been called treachery—and I agree with that word—that have been exhibited by the government.

Bill C-18, this bill's predecessor in the last parliament, was introduced after the March 27 first ministers' agreement which was heralded by the Prime Minister and all members of the House as an example of Canadian federalism at its best; an occasion when the premiers, the Prime Minister and the interested parties had sat down and worked out an agreement that was recognized across the country as fair and just. On that basis, our party was prepared to pass the enabling legislation, Bill C-18, very quickly.

However, the government chose to throw in a twist: in spite of that agreement and the good will that had overcome some of the bad will that had existed over the previous year, the government chose to throw in a veto clause. In committee this veto clause was described by Mr. Leitch, the attorney general of Alberta, as recorded at page 7 of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works for May 7, 1974, as follows:

Far from embodying a term of the first ministers' agreement it stands as a direct negation of the principles upon which that agreement was