

Canada Oil and Gas Act

knowledge of the development of this land would never make such a statement again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I want to correct an error I made earlier. It is a minor procedural one. I referred to the mover of the motion as being the Hon. Michael Wilson. It should, of course, have been:

MR. HARVIE ANDRE (FOR MR. WILSON) moved:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Accordingly, pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The House may wish now to consider Motion No. 27.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): By unanimous consent.

Mr. Harvie Andre (for Mr. Wilson) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-48, an act to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be amended in Clause 35 by striking out lines 29 to 34 at page 20.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 27 also deals with Petro-Canada and the role that it will play. It gives me an opportunity to address some of the erroneous remarks made by my hon. friend, the member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) who, incredibly, has been the energy spokesman for his party. Apparently he has learned absolutely nothing.

He accuses our party of not being consistent in principle, which I think may be the way of describing it. He says that we are operating in the dark ages if we think that the private sector is worth anything or has any future. I suggest that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway might learn something of value if he would speak to the former energy critic for the New Democratic Party during the period from 1974 to 1979,

the Hon. Tommy Douglas who now is a director of Husky Oil, which is a large Canadian oil company. I suggest the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway might learn something and be less inclined to make the asinine statements he has been making in the House.

He asked the rhetorical question why we Conservatives are not concerned about small business, and he has somehow related that to Petro-Canada.

I would remind him of two anecdotal situations with regard to Petro-Canada. I am sure he must have received a letter recently from a Mr. Barry Peacock, President of Peacock Oil of Barrie, Ontario. Mr. Peacock, an independent petroleum marketer, has a small business. He supplies oil and gas to independent service stations under the Peacock banner in the area of Orillia, Ontario. The vice-president of Petro-Canada phoned him and said that Petro-Canada had just taken over his station at a certain location. The vice-president said that Petro-Canada has a contract with the owner of that station and that it would be supplying the gas from now on. Mr. Peacock said, "Gee, I thought I had a contract with that individual; I am sure I did". He telephoned and went to see the individual whose station supposedly had been taken over by Petro-Canada from amongst his stations. The individual said, "Well, frankly they made me an offer I could not refuse". They came in, said they were going to spend \$20,000 improving the service station. They were going to put in new tanks, new pumps and new signs and give him some money for advertising locally and so forth and said they would look after any contractual obligations he had with Peacock Oil. That was the case of this great Canadian oil company that is doing things for Canadians by knocking out a piece of the business of a small Canadian independent petroleum marketer, Peacock Oil. That is a true story. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway can telephone Barrie, Ontario and ask Mr. Peacock. Perhaps he does not remember receiving the letter. He probably threw it in the garbage right away because it did not fit his philosophical leanings.

● (1740)

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway also talked about the justification for seizing 25 per cent of the privately owned assets of companies operating in the north. He said it was justifiable on the basis of tax expenditures. I remind the hon. member—I am sure he has heard it before, but he chooses to forget—that if that is a justification, then the government is perfectly justified in seizing his Registered Retirement Savings Plan, if he has one. If he has used a Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan to save for a down payment for a house, based on the rationale supplied by the hon. member the government is justified in seizing a portion of the house because if he has ever had a tax deduction by virtue of children, wife, Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan or Registered Retirement Savings Plan or taken any tax deferral scheme such as that, according to the New Democratic Party that provides the moral justification for the federal government to come in and seize part of the assets acquired by taking advantage of the tax incentives provided by this government.