

resource under foreign control, much more than would be tolerated in other industrialized countries.

It has been asserted that the recent takeovers by Canadians of foreign-controlled subsidiary companies have somehow been at fire sale prices caused by the National Energy Program. In fact, the biggest single takeover since the program was announced, the purchase of Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas from Conoco, was at a price that Conoco itself regarded as "fair and reasonable".

The bill, and the National Energy Program in general, have been developed to take into account the concerns of foreign investors as well as Canadians; but surely our friends must understand our resolve to attain one half share in our own oil and gas resources. We have heard voices in the United States which have apparently not been fully aware of the provisions of the National Energy Program and Bill C-48, and the legitimate concerns in the Canadian gas and oil sector. However, there have also been people in the United States who have grasped the essential element in our Canadianization program. For example, a Congressman from Florida recently noted in the House of Representatives that:

Attention on our (American) side is centred on Canada's new national energy policy . . . Moves by Canadian companies to take over American ones in this country have also caused a reaction here. I suggest that if we understand our own reaction to a handful of Canadian takeover efforts in the United States, we can also understand Canadian concerns when almost three quarters of Canada's energy industry is in foreign hands. In fact some 80 per cent of that foreign participation is American.

I want to note the fact that we have heard voices coming from the United States Congress which do grasp the essence of the Canadianization challenge in Canada. However, I want to conclude by quoting a Canadian. The president of the TransCanada PipeLines Company recently stated this in New York:

Americans think Canada's political motivation is hostility to the United States. No matter how much evidence there may appear to be to the contrary, this is a gross misreading of the country.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the parliamentary secretary but his time has expired. He may continue only with the unanimous consent of the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. MacLaren:** I thank the House for its indulgence, Mr. Speaker. The president of the TransCanada PipeLines went on to say:

Canada's economic policies are not anti-American, they are pro-Canadian. When the motivations are understood, they are eminently reasonable.

In conclusion, it seems clear to me and to all those who are on this side of the House that the Canadianization of the industry as outlined in the National Energy Program and Bill C-48 is both fair and reasonable for all concerned.

● (1710)

**Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate to deal with a few points raised by other hon. members, in particular the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. MacLaren),

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Evans) who spoke last Friday and those who spoke for the New Democratic Party.

First, I want to deal with this question of the 25 per cent confiscation of privately owned assets, which is part of Bill C-48 and part of the National Energy Program. The lead off spokesman for our party on this motion was the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson). He outlined our position fairly thoroughly, and if anyone wants an accurate view of where we stand, he could read his speech. However, I do want to comment on some points made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. For example, he mentioned that this 25 per cent confiscation provision is justified because tax incentives were in place when the privately held companies initiated and continued their exploration programs. The assets acquired in Canada lands through the exploration funds spent in that area were supposedly in part paid for by the taxpayers of Canada. Therefore, the Crown was justified in coming along and taking 25 per cent without remuneration.

I cannot think of a more serious precedent for this country to establish than this. Specifically, if tax incentives are in place, this justifies future governments being able to seize part of the assets acquired as part of that tax incentive.

If that principle is accepted, then clearly anyone's registered retirement savings plan falls into that category. If you have a registered retirement savings plan, it was put in place as a result of a tax incentive. In other words, there was an incentive in the system for you to save money in the RRSP. If you invested that money and it is now worth something, based on the principle outlined by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy the government is perfectly justified in taking half of that asset. According to his principle, the taxpayers paid for half of it. That is the principle the parliamentary secretary outlined. It is an absolutely absurd notion. It is intolerable.

I have examined the situation in other parts of the world to see if there were a precedent anywhere in the democratic world where a democratically elected government had seized privately-owned assets, and I could not find an example anywhere. However, what I was able to find is something called "Political Risk Services", a consulting report prepared by Frost and Sullivan, Inc. in New York City. Frost and Sullivan assess the political risk of various countries around the world for the benefit of clients. It is a rather interesting list, alphabetically arranged. It assesses things such as the probability of a regime change, the probability of political turmoil, the probability of expropriation and the probability of repatriation restrictions. There is also a political risk summary.

The expropriation column is most interesting. For example, we find the probability for expropriation expressed in percentage figures is as follows: Algeria, 24 per cent; Argentina, which is not a democratic country, 15 per cent; Australia, 14 per cent; Austria, 10 per cent; Belgium, 10 per cent; Bolivia 18 per cent; Brazil, 20 per cent and Canada, 24 per cent. The probability of expropriation in Canada is exactly the same as