

● (2050)

Thus, unless we have a national petroleum company operating as the sole purchaser and supplier in this country, there is no way of knowing whether the compensation paid is reasonable and just or whether, as the hon. member who has just spoken believes, it was a rip-off which could amount to \$1 million or \$2 million a day in loss of potential revenue to this country.

So while my party has taken some satisfaction from the fact that the government has looked at the suggestions we made to deal with the energy crisis and has at least paid lip service to some of the concepts we have put forward, unless there is a little more substance to the form they have adopted, not only will the country be in trouble with respect to its energy policy, not only will it be paying unjustified compensation to companies whose profits have already risen by an average of 46 per cent in one year but the government will find itself shortly in trouble with the Canadian people in the midst of a general election. I say this because we in the NDP cannot stand by and see the people buffaloes by oil companies which have taken advantage of a situation which has disadvantaged not only Canadians but also people throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is another hon. member who wishes to speak. There are only five or six minutes left to us, so I will conclude my remarks on that note.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of taking part in the debate on Bill C-18, although there is little one can say in four or five minutes. I should like to restrict my comments to one clause which concerns me a great deal, that is, clause 36(1). Coming as I do from one of the producing provinces, Saskatchewan, I find this clause offensive. Perhaps I should put it on the record.

Where no agreement is entered into pursuant to section 21 with the government of a producer province, or any such agreement is terminated by the declaration of the parties, or, in the opinion of the governor in council, is not effective or is not capable of being effective, the governor in council may by regulation establish maximum prices for the various qualities and kinds of crude oil to which this part applies that are produced, extracted or recovered in that province—

In my opinion, this clause is pure and simple blackmail. I am aware that the minister, speaking in this chamber yesterday, indicated, as recorded at page 1236 of *Hansard* that the government does not intend at this time to proclaim part III of the measure in which this clause is found. But in the months ahead it will be necessary for the federal government and the governments of the producing provinces to negotiate wellhead prices for oil. It is clear from the minister's remarks yesterday that the bill before us was not discussed with the various provincial premiers before its presentation to the House. I agree with the comments made by my hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) when he stated that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) should have been in touch with the producing provinces to ascertain their views on this bill before submitting it for second reading.

It is obvious that if there is to be agreement on prices, negotiations will have to take place; and how can satisfactory negotiations take place while the federal government is holding clause 36(1) of the bill like a club over the heads of the premiers? Part III contains provisions of the type

Airline Firefighters Strike

which ought to be dealt with by parliament rather than by order in council.

I see there is little time left, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicated this afternoon that the bill would be referred to the standing committee for consideration. I trust that while before the committee it will receive thorough examination and that the minister will give serious consideration to suggestions and amendments put forward by members on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I rise merely on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to confirm that after second reading the bill will be referred, not to committee of the whole but to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

AIR TRANSPORT

STRIKE BY FIREFIGHTERS AT BRITISH COLUMBIA AIRPORTS

Mr. Speaker: It being nine o'clock, pursuant to the order made earlier this day the proceedings now before the House will be interrupted in order that consideration can be given to a motion to adjourn the House under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) moves:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to take part in this emergency debate at a time when firemen employed by the Department of Transport and the Department of National Defence in the province of British Columbia have withdrawn their services in the course of an illegal strike. This has occurred as a result of—I am sorry to have to say this—a combination of circumstances which has culminated in their feeling that the negotiations being conducted between the Public Service Alliance in Canada and Treasury Board are not taking their proper interest into account.

I emphasize that this strike is an illegal one, and nothing I may say in the next few minutes should be interpreted as meaning that this House and the public of Canada approves in any way the actions of any group, no matter how strongly it may feel justified in its own case, taking the law into its own hands. In the long run, this can lead only to anarchy. I am sure all members are in agreement with me when I say this.