

Canada Petroleum Resources Act

lands. Could he clarify that point and say whether or not his Party, were it to be in office, would grant that power of veto?

Mr. Parry: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) for that very friendly question. I always enjoy discussing what our Party will do when we are in power.

I say to him very frankly that the native people of Canada are far more than private citizens. They have the commitment of the New Democratic Party to their claim to a share in oil and gas development and, more important, to their claim to a say in how that development will be carried out. However, I believe that we have a non-expressed or implicit commitment in the Constitution. We also have the commitment of the present Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on this point.

Perhaps I should reiterate that it was not suggested by the native people that they should have an absolute veto on development, but that no development on any lands subject to land claims, be they comprehensive or specific, should go forward without consultation and without the approval of the native people affected. Of course, none of these developments should ever go forward without proper provision for the participation of native people, and the employment and other economic benefits which would result.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the Hon. Member's concern about the single bidding process. I wonder whether he thoroughly read the Bill. Although there will be a single bidding process, the terms and conditions of that bidding will be clearly enunciated. For example, there could be a work project, there could be core, or the concerns could be those of the native peoples of Canada. The concerns will all be spelled out in the bid process and pre-published so that everyone in the country will know exactly what are the terms and conditions of the bid. It was done in secret before. There was wheeling and dealing behind closed doors. The Minister might have had a favourite or might have cut out the other guy because he or she did not like him. Now it will be up front. The terms and conditions will be laid out. They will be bidding on one item, on the lands as laid out, and on all the conditions which go with the issuance of an exploration licence. Does the Hon. Member not see the advantage of that to our native peoples?

Mr. Parry: Mr. Speaker, of course I am very glad to have the commitment of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary that such provisions as employment for native people and participation in the benefits will become part of the single bidding process.

Mr. McDermid: Could become.

Mr. Parry: I heard that they would become part of the process. I hear the Hon. Member saying "could". I must accept his correction of what he actually said. However, we are very glad to have it on the record whether it be "will" or "could".

In raising the point I wanted to make very clear that we in the New Democratic Party, if Bill C-92 goes through unchanged, would be looking very closely at those bids to ensure that employment and other benefits are provided for native people and that they will be consulted in the preparation of single bid documents.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow) and by my friend who spoke on the Bill, that is, the drilling in Ottawa for frontier moneys, for getting money from the Government, I draw the attention of the Hon. Member for Calgary South to my speech in the debate as reported at page 13143 of *Hansard*, in which I referred to former Energy Minister Marc Lalonde who spoke to the Energy Committee on January 20, 1981. He said at that time that some \$4.5 billion to \$5 billion had been spent to date on frontier exploration. He meant from about 1960 to about 1981. That was the period before the National Energy Program and under the old Canada oil and gas lands regulations. Mr. Lalonde felt that it was fair to say that some three-quarters of that, or some \$3 billion, had been footed by Canadian taxpayers. He went on to say that more than 90 per cent of every exploration dollar had been covered by Canadian taxpayers. Some \$3 billion was spent from 1960 to 1981, and we learned in committee that \$7.3 billion was spent in PIP grants from 1981 to 1986. That is a total of about \$10.3 billion which Canadian taxpayers have put in to subsidize the oil industry which feels it has been treated so badly in frontier development and exploration.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government ran the country for 16 long years, and it led Canadians into a pit of debt so deep that a quarter of federal revenues must go to service our national debt. Canadians are fed up with wasting productive revenue on debt interest.

By the end of the decade, the measures announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in his recent Budget will stop the national debt growing faster than the national economy. In just over 20 months we have begun to reverse 16 years of Liberal damage. We promised to reduce the deficit, and we have. We said we would create jobs, and we are. In 20 months more than 580,000 new jobs have been created and 82 per cent of these are full-time jobs. The official number of unemployed has fallen by about 17 per cent from September, 1984. But that is not the entire picture, Mr. Speaker. Tens of thousands of Canadians who had exhausted their unemployment benefits and therefore no longer counted among the officially unemployed are also finding jobs. Canadians are finding jobs because the economy has improved. The economic upturn is a direct result of the policies and programs this Government has introduced.

• (1240)

The frontier policy statement made on October 30, 1985 ended the five year nightmare thrust upon our economy, particularly upon our energy sector, by the Liberals' National