

*Canada Petroleum Resources Act*

They go on to state:

—we protest in the strongest possible terms the enactment of any federal statute which facilitates the alienation of our land and resources from under our feet.

It is nonsense for the Government to say that energy is not significant and is separate from land claims. Energy is very important to the north. Our Constitution provides that the Government negotiate land claims with the native people. However, at the same time, the Government is giving away various interest and rights in the subsoil to the oil companies. I believe that this conflict reflects a flaw in the Bill.

The Minister said that he wants to rely on the entrepreneurial spirit of the companies to develop the resources. We all want to see the entrepreneurial spirit of Canadian business used. However, the Government is playing in a very big league with Exxon, Mobil and Shell, which makes it very difficult for small Canadian companies to move into the frontiers. That is why we need Petro-Canada. It has enough clout to compete with those big companies in the offshore. Even larger Canadian companies like Husky and Bow Valley will find it difficult to move into the frontier without some government incentive. That is why they have closed their exploration operations and nothing is happening on the East Coast.

Indeed, some of the smaller Canadian companies are in danger of being swallowed up by the large foreign companies. The progress we have made toward Canadianization could easily be reversed in the next few years. I believe that the federal Government and some of the spokespeople for the industry have put themselves into an ideological straitjacket. While the New Democrats have often been accused of being ideologues, the federal Government and some in the industry are ideologues in the sense that they believe in a free market in world oil that is primarily controlled by OPEC. When the world price begins to fall through the floor, they are not in favour of a stabilization program. Yet, if the price of oil begins to rise to \$50 or \$60 a barrel, is it reasonable to believe that the Government of Canada will not put a ceiling on the price of oil? That is what it will do, just like the Liberals did with the National Energy Program. Why are they denying themselves the protection of a floor price, or stabilization price, when the price of oil goes through the floor?

The Government said that it accepted an amendment to the Bill. The amendment was that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) or the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight) could choose a member of the public to be on an environmental advisory panel, rather than having only civil servants. Big deal!

It is significant to note that an amendment proposed by a Conservative Member from Calgary to make paper work easier for the oil companies was accepted by the Government. We proposed an amendment that would have department environmentalists involved in the north. That amendment was rejected. We proposed an amendment that would give native people a better say and would develop some programs for the advancement and training of native people. That was rejected, in spite of the fact that they live there. It is a clear example of

the priorities of the Government. It is a Government by and for the big oil companies whom they represent. Indeed, the big oil companies wrote the policy of the Government.

**Mr. Reimer:** Rubbish!

**Mr. Waddell:** Look at the words "engine of economic growth; 300,000 jobs". Those words come from the 1983 presentation of the Canadian Petroleum Association. This Bill will also represent a time in our history when the Government chose to cave in to American pressure and get rid of the back-in provisions which would give Petro-Canada 25 per cent of production, even though the Canadian Government, through the taxpayers, has put in over \$7.3 billion in grants in the last seven years. We have been pushed around by the Americans, and the Government has caved in. While it is necessary to have a good relationship with the Americans since they are our friends and neighbours, we must stand up and be independent. I suggest that the Conservatives will pay a price in the next election because the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is too close to his buddy down south.

In conclusion, let me expand on something said by the Hon. Member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan), the Liberal energy critic. Canada does not have an energy policy. The Government is adrift, with no energy policy, and is in fact relying on buying offshore oil and letting our industry go.

The Conservatives are forgetting about their old policy that energy was an engine of economic growth which created many jobs. As the Hon. Member pointed out, 40,000 jobs have been lost in Alberta and, after the deregulation of natural gas, there will be up to 70,000 jobs lost.

I am not suggesting that it is possible to wave a magic wand and develop an energy program to put those people back to work, but I suggest that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources should very carefully consider developing a new energy policy that is based upon the notion of maintaining our industry at a level where it can be more easily revved up in the future. I think most Members of the House would agree with the general parameters of such a policy. What will happen is that the price of energy will shoot up again and we will not be in a position to start up again in the Venture field, Hibernia, the Beaufort or the tar sands and we will put our energy security into doubt.

● (1750)

I suggest that the Government bring in a new energy policy. We in the NDP will assist in any way we can. I see the Hon. Member laughing. I would remind him that the Opposition in Alberta is the NDP.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Not by much.

**Mr. Waddell:** I would think we want to work together on this. We are going to have some disagreements but if the Member thinks about it, we need a new energy policy and we need a way of dealing with the tar sands and the price of oil