

stated there is going to be a certain revenue sharing formula but there cannot be any revenue sharing if the Government is not determined in its position to have development take place. Until there is development there will not be any development sharing and the equity position is not there. All we have is the hope that some day something is going to happen. If the Government is to stay in power, which it will not, there would not be anything happening, certainly not until well after the turn of the century.

Motion No. 15 reads:

The Minister shall require that any benefits plan submitted pursuant to subsection (2) include provisions to ensure that aboriginal people and disadvantaged individuals or groups have priority access to training and employment.

I think it is safe to say that in the high Arctic this now applies to everyone because, as I mentioned earlier, the fragile economy which was there has been severely disrupted. We are going to have a great many native people unemployed, as well as other people. I think we will see quite a few people leaving the area, which in itself will have a detrimental effect on the economy. Those who stay will be severely handicapped, particularly the young who we as a Government encouraged away from the traditional lifestyles of hunting, fishing and other occupations. We encouraged them to get involved in the oil and gas industry. We have now left them without any hope to further their employment in the area in which they made such a promising start.

I think this amendment is not only fair, it has been requested by the Inuvik region. In a report to the Executive Council on the impacts of the oil industry slowdown on the local economy were suggested measures to improve the economic climate in the near term. It is suggested that further training take place very quickly because we have to do something with these people. It is fine to go in with economic promises and then pull out when the economic climate is not as great as it once was, but we have to look at the human element. We have affected people's lives; we have affected the economy and the lifestyle in this area, and we cannot as a Government and as Members of Parliament simply walk away and say: "Too bad the world price of oil and gas is not what it once was. Tough luck. Maybe this will come together later on". In the meantime we have shattered the dreams of these people, and in many cases we have broken up a great many families in the affected regions. I think the Government has to do something to deal with this question.

Mr. Paul Gagnon (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat amazing that the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—the Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) would support Motion No. 15 which, to me, flies right against the Charter of Rights that his Party, and he as a Member, were so strongly pushing to entrench into Canadian history.

This is a section which takes a group of people and says they are special, but not geographically. If he said the northern people were special, including everyone, as we are contemplating doing with the Newfoundland Accord, I could understand it, but when one just takes a group of people, it flies in the face

of the Charter. I do not understand it. It is against the Charter. Yet the Hon. Member, who is a supporter of the Charter, says he likes this motion.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to comment on these four motions. I am particularly inspired by the comments of the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Gagnon). I had feared the Conservative majority might well be opposed to these resolutions, and the comments made by the Hon. Member tend to confirm that.

Let me say immediately, since that comment will be still ringing in the minds of those of us in the Chamber and others watching in other places, that the argument the Hon. Member has made misses one vital point. The fact that we target various groups in Canadian society as a means of dealing with their social inequities and the disparities they have experienced in times past, is in no way in contradiction of the Charter. What the Hon. Member's comment underscores is that the Government is opposed to these several resolutions, at least, that is what I fear.

I want to say something about each of them briefly. Since my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), has made good arguments for each of them, I would like to underscore them in a more general sense and deal specifically with the points of each one. I want to do that by recognizing that the Government has served up to us in the last weeks celebrations of individualism, the importance of initiative being exercised by people wherever they may be. Surely, these resolutions are designed to ensure that just that kind of local initiative will be recognized and protected by Government. Surely, what is necessary is to ensure that the Government of Canada does not once more allow outsiders to come in, in the form of one or other of the petroleum companies, to do what they will on northern or offshore lands without any regard for the aboriginal rights which have not yet been settled.

Surely, this would be one more expression of the kind of imperialism we have seen too much of in Canadian history. It is one more assertion by the Canadian Government on behalf of swash bucklers, whether individuals or corporations, who will do what they will without any regard to local rights.

We must write into the Bill an assurance that their activities are subject to legal action. They may well find their discoveries under challenge. They will have to share, or they may find themselves actually losing these rights and losing the lands on which they have carried out exploration because they may turn out to belong, as the motion says, in fee simple, to the aboriginal peoples. Surely, a Government which has regard for the rights of aboriginal peoples, which wants to ensure they have something in the way of resources to develop their local initiative, would want to include this motion in the Bill as a protection for them.

The second motion provides for the development of a benefit plan. Surely, this is only to ensure that those companies which