

*Canada Petroleum Resources Act*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think I should advise the Hon. Member and other Hon. Members that under the rules each Member is limited to 10 minutes of debate. I do not want the Hon. Member to be unable to make his point in respect of the second amendment, and I advise him that there is a minute remaining.

**Mr. Waddell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to conclude my remarks in a minute. I might ask the House for an extra minute to put my two points.

I was referring to the letter wherein it indicated that that wording was consistent with the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act. It continues:

—and Section 117(2) of this Bill which deals with the constitutionally entrenched rights of the Inuvialuit. If you are not willing to withdraw all lands subject to aboriginal title from disposition under this Bill we urge, that at a bare minimum, you make provision for withdrawal on a case by case basis.

All we are asking in the first amendment is to bring it in line with the Sechelt formula. There may be a clash between the legislation and the Constitution, and we want to make clear that the Constitution is primary. Oil companies want certainty. Why not the native people? I do not think anyone objected to this particular amendment in the committee hearings; the oil companies did not object to it. I think the Government can accept the first amendment.

The second amendment goes a little further because it comes at the problem from a different angle in fact.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired. He indicated that he might ask for consent to continue for a very brief period of time to finish his remarks. Is there such consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Waddell:** Thank you. I have made my point on the first amendment. I think the Government can expect it. It is consistent with another Act, and it does not go that far.

I admit, however, that the second amendment goes further. In part it reads:

All lands subject to unsettled aboriginal claims, which have been accepted for negotiation by the federal Government, are excluded from the application of this Act.

In fact it indicates that if they are negotiating with the aboriginal peoples, they cannot turn around and alienate or give away part of their land from under their feet. It is not good enough for the Government to say that it is just giving an oil company a drilling permit, because that is dealing with the land in a very important way.

I draw the Government's attention to that point. I hope it has a copy of the letter which was written on October 10 and sent to the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada. Those are my points on the first two motions.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak in support of the amendments

of the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). Something very relevant or very important is at stake here, that is, the attitude of the Government of Canada toward our native people.

It has been stated that we have the right to interfere with or intervene in the land claims question and, as the native people themselves have indicated, to take it out from under their feet. It is important that everyone in Canada support the discussions of the land claims question. Everyone should be interested in resolving the question. We cannot arbitrarily state the position of these lands until we know exactly for what the lands will be used.

How can we say that these lands will be removed from the negotiations and given away for other purposes? How are we going to expect the native peoples to believe the Government of Canada is negotiating this question in good faith?

• (1140)

The very Bill we have before us this morning is at the present time an exercise in futility. The policies of the Government have completely stripped any relevancy in today's world away from this Bill. With Bill C-5 having been completely nullified by the policies of the Government I do not think that we should go one step further and act so arbitrarily concerning our native people.

The recent decisions in Beaufort, in the north, where the major oil companies have stopped exploration and activity, mean that the fragile economy of the Northwest Territories and, to some extent, the Yukon as well, will be severely jeopardized and may essentially collapse in the northern part of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

We have, particularly with respect to the younger generation, encouraged the native people to become involved in the oil and gas industry, in the exploration and in what we stated emphatically would be development following on the heels very quickly of exploration. But we have snatched away the incentives for the companies and the companies in direct retaliation have closed down.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am enjoying the comments of my friend, the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan), but I do not believe he is talking about the amendments to the Bill. His speech sounds more like a third reading speech. Could he discuss the issue at hand?

**Mr. MacLellan:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Parliamentary Secretary, what I am saying is directly linked to the condition of the native peoples and the economy in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. What we are doing is adding to this downturn in the economy by relegating the native people to an uncertain position concerning their own lands. This is not something that most Canadians would want done. We have received letters, testimony and a lot of arguments from the native groups, as my friend, the Hon. Member