

of the questions on the Order Paper. There have been over 500 new questions put on the Order Paper since then, many placed there by the hon. member. I believe the hon. member should be referred to Section 363 of *Beauchesne*, which says that insistence on an answer is out of order.

The hon. member says that he may continue to raise this point. I submit, Madam Speaker, the hon. member is really out of order in continuing to insist upon answers when we have gone out of our way to come up with the answers to most of his questions.

Mr. Cossitt: I rise on a further point or order, Madam Speaker. I should like to clarify the reference the parliamentary secretary made to what I said. I do not know whether he said it sounded racist or what, but I was using an expression that is simply a common expression. It has gone beyond the point—

Madam Speaker: The hon. member is now debating.

Mr. Cossitt: If the remark was taken as a racist remark by anyone, I would naturally withdraw it. To me it is similar to saying "where there is smoke, there is fire". It is simply a matter of fact. I certainly was not intending a racial slur of any kind. I should like to make that very clear.

I know there is no insistence in the rules that questions must be answered. I acknowledge that point. On the other hand, there is a moral obligation that requires something to be done in the nature of answers to questions. I do not believe I am wrong in raising points of order. I believe it is my privilege. I could even make it a question of privilege that I have the privilege to raise points of order. It is a well established precedent of this House that a member has that right if the government ignores questions or it tries to hide something. Granted, the government can keep hiding it for another five and a half or ten and a half years if they are that hard up in not letting the Canadian people know the answers.

I believe it is an error to impugn my motives by saying I have no right to raise points of order in this regard. I will certainly continue to raise them when the government deliberately and obviously denies information to the House and to the Canadian people about answers they are rightly entitled to have, unless the Chair rules me out of order.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

The House resumed from Friday, October 30, consideration of Bill C-48, to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Com-

Canada Oil and Gas Act

mittee on National Resources and Public Works, and Motion No. 23 (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Madam Speaker, last Friday afternoon we commenced debate on Motion No. 28 with regard to Bill C-48. I shall refer to some remarks that were made by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson). My hon. friend pointed out that the position of the Conservative Party is that we do not believe in any form of confiscation. We do not think the back-in provision is right. This clause concerning confiscation is causing serious problems across the country and the mass exodus of funds from businesses leaving this country. In a few moments I shall go into detail.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. McKenzie: My hon. friend from Calgary South, as reported at page 12365 of *Hansard*, said this:

I should like to return to what I believe to be the broader aspects of Bill C-48 and their impact on Canada. One question we should consider is where we will find the money. Energy self-sufficiency is a nice goal. It sounds nice, it is a nice phrase. But where will we find the money?

At the rate we are going with Bill C-48, the National Energy Program, we will have difficulty finding the money. Someone has to think up these National Energy Programs for Bill C-48. The October, 1981, edition of *Saturday Night* went into some detail as to who was drawing up these socialistic and nationalistic bills. *Saturday Night* points out:

Ottawa's energy policies have created a new rogue's gallery for the oilpatch. Marc Lalonde, the energy minister, is cast in the most satanic light, but the bureaucracy has also produced villains, Ed Clark, one of the authors of the NEP document—

—and probably Bill C-48—

—has assumed a notoriety in Calgary never previously accorded a civil servant. A mythical view of him has seeped down even to the roughnecks, among whom he's variously rumoured to have been either an aide to Che Guevara or Fidel Castro's right-hand man.

Selected quotations from his PhD thesis—"Socialist development and public investment in Tanzania, 1964-73"—are passed around as proof of his communist leanings.

No wonder these bills have so much support from the NDP.

What's more, Clark seems impervious to the most hypnotic technical logic of Calgary's promoters. "He's just not interested in permeability and porosity," moans Jim Gray, "I don't talk to him any more."

Ed Clark cannot even consult with members of the energy industry.

The article went on to say:

If Ed Clark has emerged as the newest bête noire, he at least has only to travel occasionally to Alberta. For Ottawa's men on the spot, the heat in the past year has been intense. The brunt of vilification falls on Bill Hopper and Joel Bell. They were always clearly Ottawa men in the eyes of the oilpatch, but the period of Tory rule stamped them as Liberal Ottawa men—cynical manipulators who politicized PetroCan for the defeat of Joe Clark. Those executives who showed insufficient loyalty in that period, who even suggested to the Tory task force that Hopper and Bell might be the problem with PetroCan, paid the price when the Liberals returned to power.

In other words, revenge, Mr. Speaker. With regard to Bill C-48 the Liberals tell the Canadian people about their energy