

*Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

greater power in the resource field being given to these very corporations.

In the last four or five decades we have seen the extent to which the power and control exercised by these corporations has increased. And what has been the vehicle they have been using? To a large degree, their expansion has been possible as a result of the compliance and subservience not only of the federal government but also of the tribunals set up under the federal government. I do not care whether one considers the National Energy Board, the Transport Commission or just about any of the other tribunals and agencies of the government: for one reason or another, perhaps without intent, they have assisted in the process by which large foreign corporations are amassing greater power and control. Not only do I share the hon. member's suspicions with respect to the intent of the corporations, but I am suspicious of federal tribunals, especially when they are made up of people about whom we know nothing. Here we face the prospect of an unformed tribunal using known procedures, a tribunal which under the bill before us has been given almost unlimited power.

The purpose of the amendment before the House is, first, to restrict the power of the tribunal and, second, to furnish an appeal procedure to the court system so that in the event of a hasty or unjust decision a remedy will be available to the little man as well as to the corporations or anyone else. I am quite willing to assent to the government's wishes, to go along with what it has suggested and turn my back on the amendment put forward by my own colleague, if I can get two assurances from the minister. First, I wonder if the minister can assure us that the tribunal would never be used to abrogate or circumvent the procedures established in respect of public hearings which now exist under the National Energy Board Act with regard to pipeline expropriations.

The reason I am talking about pipeline expropriation is simply this: I represent in this House an Ontario constituency across which this pipeline must pass if it is to go from Sarnia to Montreal, and I would be failing in my duty if I did not call attention to the fact that the people of my riding are upset about expropriations not only by this government but by other levels of government.

**An hon. Member:** What expropriations? Tell us about them.

**Mr. Lawrence:** The minister seemed to give some kind of assurance, but he left it in very woolly terms. Can he assure us that this tribunal will never be used to circumvent or abrogate the safeguards I have mentioned? He can give us a simple assurance, yes or no.

My second point is this. The hon. member for York South says the question of appeal to the courts is already covered by other legislation; that this tribunal would be bound by that legislation and that appeal would be possible to the Federal Court. I think the hon. member for York South is disregarding a clause in this bill under which, merely by regulation, the safeguards afforded by federal legislation or, for that matter, by provincial legislation could be removed.

My hon. friends and I are deeply concerned about this aspect. This is an all-powerful piece of legislation which

[Mr. Lawrence.]

could be used to override many of the safeguards contained in other legislation. If the minister can assure me that in the event of an appeal arising from action taken by the tribunal, the federal government will not contest such an appeal solely on the ground that there is lack of jurisdiction, and will do nothing to abrogate the right to go to the federal Court of Appeal with respect to a decision of the tribunal, I will accept such an assurance and refrain from supporting my hon. friend's amendment. In the absence of such assurances, I believe the House has a duty to vote in favour of the amendment put forward tonight to this clause.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

● (2300)

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** I gather hon. members would expect the Chair to defer this division until tomorrow or to some other time to be agreed upon following discussions between members of the parties.

It being eleven o'clock, pursuant to the agreement reached earlier this evening, a motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been moved and seconded.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

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

### AIR TRANSPORT—PROPOSED PASSENGER HEAD TAX— SUGGESTED PERCENTAGE CHARGE ON SHORT FLIGHTS

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that my voice will last through the short time I have at my disposal. On January 3 and 4, the first two days following our return from the Christmas recess, I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) some questions relating to the head tax that he proposed to levy against passengers using commercial airlines. I was not satisfied with the replies he gave me on that occasion, hence my request that I take this matter up at ten o'clock.

It has been my contention all along that the single levy would impose a burden inequitably on air travellers using