

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

risking economic development, and I urge the minister to weigh very carefully the advice and the views of experts who appear before the committee.

● (1630)

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, on behalf of the NDP, to take part in this debate on Bill C-48. Previously the Canadian oil and gas regulations were debated only in the boardrooms of government departments and of oil companies. Some of the provisions in the bill governing the industry in the north and offshore are set out in some detail. As a matter of fact they are set out in so much detail that I agree with the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), who spoke before me, that it is very difficult, as a result, to deal with this bill in a lot of detail this afternoon, a bill which we received only 48 hours ago.

What I want to do is to discuss major parts of the bill, and later on to deal in committee with some of the other provisions of the bill. I should say right away to the minister that we in the NDP oppose the bill, and I will give some reasons as to why we oppose it. One of the major reasons is that in the past Canadians have really been international patsies with respect to our policy which allowed companies to come in and develop our oil and gas, especially in the north where the Government of Canada, which pretends to know better and which should know better, allowed quite open development.

The hon. member for Etobicoke Centre said we were somewhat like a banana republic in the sense that we seemed to be depriving people of property and investments which they had made in good faith. I, too, am against depriving people of property and investments made in good faith, but when I heard the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) yell about the "immorality of the situation" being staggering, to use his words, I thought of what my constituents think about the immorality of the situation of, for example, Dome Petroleum in the Beaufort Sea. The fact is that that is a company which has been subsidized almost completely by public moneys, a company with all kinds of tax write-offs, the most incredible tax write-offs, a company which has never paid and is not paying any income tax. That company has admitted it in Victoria at a symposium and a debate which I attended this summer with the president of the company. My constituents think it is pretty immoral on the part of the company and pretty stupid on the part of the government to allow that situation to occur.

I have said that we have had a resource give-away unparalleled in any country in modern times, and I would draw hon. members attention to an article written way back in 1973 by Professor Andrew Thompson entitled "Canada's Petroleum Leasing Policy—A Cornucopia For Whom?", and subsequent articles written on Canada's leasing policies in the north. It is quite clear, if you read some of the work by Dr. Thompson and others, that they talk about a free entry system and about rights that are excessive, which go on and on, that there is no end to these free rights. They talk about a system which does

not promote turnovers and does not promote government intervention.

But that is in the past, is it not, Mr. Speaker? In the past we have seen, under Liberal governments by and large, that of the 290 million acres held under permit in our frontier lands, only 110 million acres are held by Canadian-controlled companies, and of the Canadian-controlled companies, Petro-Canada holds 60 per cent. When we look at this bill, when we examine it in detail, we should remember that it is the same old gang, the same sponsor who brought in the previous regulations which I have described as a resource give-away unparalleled in any country in modern times, who is bringing in these new regulations. The question arises as to why they have changed. Is it because we have a new minister, the genial and amicable member for Outremont (Mr. Lalonde)? He is smiling, not because I said that but because he is just back from Paris.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Waddell:** Some of my colleagues say that "old iron-clad" is back from Paris.

**An hon. Member:** Latex man.

**Mr. Waddell:** In any case, Mr. Speaker, one has to ask why they have changed. If you had listened to the minister speak, as I did a few minutes ago, you would have found it to be, as Mr. Diefenbaker used to say, the greatest conversion since Saul on the road to Damascus. Suddenly the minister proposes a new program of Canadianization. Essentially this is why we oppose this bill.

I want to say something about Canadianization. I have a different word for it. It is not a new word and you can look it up in the dictionary. I call it "lalondization", or "lalonding". "Lalonding" is defined as the illusion of control by Canadians when, in fact, it is the same old control by foreign oil companies. That is what this bill is.

**An hon. Member:** What dictionary are you using?

**Mr. Waddell:** It is a west coast dictionary. I say that because many people in the country, many well-meaning people, are really concerned—I think people are concerned in spite of what the Conservative party says—about the large oil companies and the shape of the development through these companies in the future. In spite of what the hon. member for Calgary Centre might say, many people are concerned, and they tend to want to support the government on this because they are in favour of Canadianization. Who is not? The Liberals are, we are, and the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre said a few moments ago that he was. But the problem is that many Canadian people think that Canadianization really means public control. Well, it is not public control, because if you look at the oil and energy policy you find there are no detailed provisions for public control. Which companies will Petro-Canada take over, when, how much are they going to pay, how are they going to do it? There is nothing there.