

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Perhaps we can make it clear that it will be with the permission of the hon. member if he chooses to entertain it.

**Mr. Roche:** I certainly welcome the opportunity of answering questions rather than trying to ask them, but if the minister will let me proceed for a few moments, at the end of my speech I will welcome her questions and will try to leave her some time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, what we are attempting to do as a centrepiece of this particular motion before us is not to go into the larger questions of the law of the sea—which again I say to the minister ought to be debated in this House, and I fault the government for not having brought before the House a significant debate on the law of the sea—but rather to concentrate for a moment on the rights of the provinces.

The bill before us is an expression of the philosophy of the government regarding the best way to maximize its take from the offshore provinces, indeed from the north, the two central aspects of the Canada lands which are before us. The sensitivities of the people of the north and the provinces bordering the oceans are apparently just inconveniences the government lightly brushes aside. So far as members of the government in this House are concerned, they evoke the same kind of yawn which must have creased Marie Antoinette's lips when she heard the poor of Paris clamouring for bread. That unfortunate queen misread the mood of the people, as indeed the present government misreads the mood of the north and the coastal provinces.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has proclaimed self-sufficiency and Canadianization as the goals of this bill. I do not know how we can seriously believe his words when we see the most recent report of the Canadian Petroleum Association, when we recognize the decision to put the Cold Lake development on an indefinite hold, which indeed could put it off into the far distant future. That plant would have produced 167,000 barrels a day by 1987. I do not know how the minister can keep proclaiming that he has the best interests of the development of energy in Canada in mind when the Canadian Petroleum Association in its review said:

The 1981 spending outlook has been dimmed by the National Energy Program. The Association's projections prior to NEP foresaw exploration and capital expenditures in excess of \$10 billion for the year. It is now expected that only approximately \$6.5 billion will be spent. This would be a reduction of 22 per cent from the 1980 spending level. The impact on the industry's activity level will even be greater because of inflationary cost increases: e.g. drilling completions are forecast to drop to 6,400 compared with 9,200 in 1980. An early resolution of the energy impasse is required to improve the investment outlook.

● (2140)

This is the fundamental background with which we began debate at report stage of this bill. The government is showing the same disregard for the feelings of the north, to touch on the north for a moment, as it showed for the feelings and the claims of Albertans.

I should like to refer to the report of the Canadian Catholic Bishops' Social Affairs Commission wherein it indicated:

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

In effect, this proposed legislation would further entrench the people of the North in a situation of colonialism in Canada. It not only threatens to violate the aboriginal rights of the native peoples but it also threatens to deny all the peoples of the North some of the basic democratic rights and freedoms which we have to know and expect in other regions of Canada.

The question before us is very simple: Do we care for the future of the inhabitants of the Northwest Territories and for the future development of the coastal provinces of our great country? Do we want both these tremendously important areas of Canada to be truly a part of the Canadian mosaic? This bill, particularly in its form at report stage, does not give me much hope. I believe it is a selfish bill, the enrichment of Ottawa being its principal aim. This is the fundamental point I wanted to draw to the attention of the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola). It is a bill without a vision. It is a bill that the people of the north and those of the coastal provinces will remember with bitterness for many years to come.

In the moment remaining I would say that we ought to think seriously about the northern leaders' conference which was held in Yellowknife in March of this year. It categorically castigated the present government for ignoring the most crucial concerns of the north—those of political development, the settlement of aboriginal rights, as well as resource ownership and control.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources continues to demonstrate before the House and the country a spirit of confrontation rather than one of co-operation. He is taking steps to move us backward in the true development of our resource strength which our country and indeed the world needs. The policy whereby we continue to import offshore oil in the amount of \$5.5 billion to \$6 billion this year, in my judgment, ought to be most severely criticized. This oil is needed in other parts of the world. We have sufficient oil here if we put our own act together to develop and produce it properly. This policy should not be criticized on grounds of politics or partisanship. It should be criticized on grounds of fairness for a world in need of resources. The very idea of closing a \$12 billion oil plant because we cannot reach an energy agreement is a problem beyond belief.

Hon. members on this side are determined to keep putting these points of view forward. I know how little the government listens, but we on this side of the House will show some determination by speaking out on behalf of true energy development, on behalf of all people of Canada, and on behalf of true regional development. It is our duty, and it is what we intend to do.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I know the hon. Minister for Mines is seeking the floor on a point of order and I know it is intended as a question for the hon. member for Edmonton South. Is there unanimous consent of the House to extend the hon. member's time for a moment in order to permit the hon. minister to ask her question?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.