

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) said during his short remarks on this piece of legislation that he was very sorry that legislation had not been in place for that period of time prior to this. We have been waiting for governments, of which he has been a member, to bring in that legislation for eleven years.

We could easily put this off for another few days to listen to the comments of hon. members on the very serious problems affecting the country in the areas of interest rates, high unemployment and transportation policy, as the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) proposed. But having said that, we must continue with the consideration of Bill C-48.

Before I continue, I should like to say on behalf of hon. members on this side of the House who sat on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works that we recognize the very strong contributions made by the witnesses on Bill C-48 during the early part of this year. On behalf of my party I should like to thank the officials from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the representatives from the industry, native peoples and governments of the north, fisheries representatives, people interested in the environment, as well as government officials who came all the way from Norway, for their very strong contributions in developing an understanding of what is a very complex bill. I am only sorry that the government has not seen fit to listen to their representations. Many of their very worth-while suggestions and proposals have not found their way into the amendments before us.

● (1600)

If you recall, Mr. Speaker, this bill was rushed in on very short notice just before the summer recess. That was contrary to the understanding that I had with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. As a result, some very important amendments were missed. I want to say at this point that I hope the government and the New Democratic Party will allow these amendments to be introduced following discussions with my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre), who will be responsible for this bill and who will be negotiating with his colleagues.

This bill is one of a series of pieces of legislation which arise out of the energy program which was first announced last October. It displays ineptness and a lack of understanding of an energy policy on the part of this government.

Since the summer adjournment, two energy agreements have been concluded, one with the province of Alberta and one with the province of British Columbia. The government is very proud of these agreements and has been quick to congratulate itself from one end of the country to the other. But these agreements have just resulted in a larger revenue grab than ever by two levels of government, and a tax increase which over the next five years, including the energy agreement and the energy program, will result in over \$50 billion falling due to the federal government.

Consumers who trusted the government in the 1980 election, who accepted what the government said when it was in opposi-

tion—to vote Liberal to keep energy prices down—have now been hammered further by energy price increases that were inconceivable when they cast their ballots in February, 1980. On top of the record inflation we have today, the record interest rates and unemployment of 8.2 per cent, these new energy prices will have a greater impact than if they had been introduced in the early part of last year. The government's flip-flop, its lack of negotiation last year and these Liberal failures, take a tremendous human toll when added to high interest rates and high unemployment.

The problem has not been solved yet, Mr. Speaker. Drill rigs are still leaving the country. There is still a job loss in the energy services organizations in Alberta and the major energy projects at Cold Lake and Alsands are still on hold.

All this makes it more important than ever that we ensure that Bill C-48 is good legislation. The government has seriously damaged the development in provincial lands so we must do everything we possibly can to ensure there is orderly and progressive development of the Canada lands. We must not add another failure to the government's long list of failures in its first 18 months of office.

Let me review the Conservative Party's position on motion No. 3 which is now before us, Mr. Speaker. This is essentially a jurisdictional issue. We feel that rather than grab the jurisdiction of the various parts set out in Bill C-48 unilaterally, it is essential that the government negotiate. The government should not grab these lands as the result of the simple, innocuous amendment that is before us in motion No. 3.

The rate of development and the impact of this development on the communities involved is of great importance to people in Canada. We on this side of the House are very concerned that all the people directly affected should have the opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies leading to that development. This is a jurisdictional dispute, Mr. Speaker, a dispute which we feel must not be acted upon in a unilateral way. The Government of Canada must respect the regions and work with them in the development of these lands. That would not be the case as Bill C-48 stands.

The position of the Conservative Party was set out in a letter from the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) to the Premier of Newfoundland in September, 1979, which stated quite clearly that Newfoundland should own the mineral resources of the continental margin in so far as Canada should own them; that ownership and legislative jurisdiction would be consistent with and subject to the division of legislative competence between the federal government and the provinces; and finally, that the Government of Canada would continue to have legislative jurisdiction in certain areas such as environment, shipping and so on. The position that we have taken, therefore, is to give the coastal provinces the same jurisdictional position on natural resources as is the case with the landlocked provinces of this country.

There is a very good reason for this, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is very clear to anyone who has travelled, particularly to the east coast, to the provinces of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, as I did in the summer of 1980 with my family. The