

CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

YORK CONDOMINIUM CORPORATION NO. 46—MOTION UNDER
S.O. 43

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. CMHC took majority control of the board of directors of York Condominium Corporation No. 46 in May of 1980, and then went on to take total control in February of this year. The CMHC lawyer stated that it was to "rejuvenate" the project and to make residents proud of the area. It has now been almost a year and there has been no rejuvenation and no pride in the project. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Lang):

That this House instruct CMHC to place residents of York Condominium Corporation No. 46 back on its board of directors so that the residents can proudly help to rejuvenate the project and, furthermore, review its policy in these matters.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lang: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I did not second that motion.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry, Madam Speaker. It should be the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean).

Madam Speaker: The motion will be corrected to indicate the hon. member for Waterloo. It still does not have the approval of the House.

* * *

● (1115)

ENERGY

SUGGESTED COMPREHENSIVE PRICING REGIME—MOTION
UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

The nation is experiencing a national catastrophe; energy self-sufficiency is being sacrificed to political ideology, and massive energy projects which should be proceeding are stalled due to political intransigence. The resumption of energy pricing meetings with the producing provinces is welcomed. In support of the success of such meetings, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson):

That the federal government announce, prior to the meetings, a new proposed comprehensive pricing regime for conventional oil production, for oil sands production, heavy oil production, tertiary oil production, offshore and frontier oil production as the basis for successful negotiations with the producing provinces.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Oral Questions

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

PRICING PRACTICES OF OIL COMPANIES—REPORTED WINDFALL
PROFITS—COLLECTION OF PETROLEUM COMPENSATION
CHARGE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and follows some questions by my colleague, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre, yesterday, on a provision in government policy which appears to have allowed a \$172 million windfall profit to oil companies operating in Canada. The minister will have had an opportunity to be briefed more fully than he was yesterday when he responded to those questions. Will he tell the House, first of all, whether the government collected the petroleum compensation charge on the inventories the industry had on hand on December 31, 1980?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, the practice which has been followed with regard to petroleum compensation charges under the latest increases from January 1 is the same as that which has been followed over the last three years, at least. There were two similar increases when the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition was Prime Minister, and the practice has been the same.

As far as the collection is concerned, collection is taken on the product before it enters inventory, before it goes into stock. Therefore the collection is paid by the refiners on what goes into the stock or into inventory. There is no charge on what is in inventory. This is considered as income, and what happens is that the companies are paying income tax and are complaining that they are being charged income tax by the federal government on what is, in their view, and what is rightly, a purely paper profit.

Mr. Clark: Madam Speaker, what is germane in the minister's long answer, designed to conceal rather than to communicate, is the admission that there was no charge on the inventory. Will the minister now tell the House of Commons whether the industry was allowed to increase prices on those inventories by an amount equal to \$2.50 per barrel?

Mr. Lalonde: Yes, Madam Speaker. I said this is the practice that has been followed for the last three years. The same practice has been maintained. The industry complains, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, that the 60-day delay which is imposed for passing on increases in terms of domestic crude is much too long and the companies are losing