

per cent of the interest in each of them. There is no other word for it but tricky.

Let us assume that a Canadian company had offered to spend a million dollars for a lease giving it the right to explore a certain parcel of land in the north country, and that it was given that parcel of land on the understanding that the million dollars would be devoted to exploration. Whoever obtained the lease decided that in order to raise the amount, he would have to share out the interest he had acquired. Let us say he did this with ten partners who each put in \$100,000, making up the \$1 million. They drill, they write off a large portion of their expenses, and they find a viable deposit of oil. At this point they can go into production and sell their oil. There is a royalty as the oil comes out of the ground. That is fair enough. There is a tax imposed on the sale of the oil or gas. That is fair enough. But now another element enters into the picture, namely, this bill. The government says, "Whoa, let me in for 25 per cent of the interest which the ten partners have so graciously provided." This is expropriation, and there is no other word for it. I submit further that it is a breach of contract.

I wonder how a government that prides itself on the legality of operations, particularly as they affect constitutional matters, can reconcile in its mind, its twisted curved mind, this sort of illegality. It is expropriation and breach of contract. I suggest also that it is probably easy to understand this government carrying out such a land baron robbery, when one recalls that it is the same government that refused to include the right to enjoyment of private property in its famous bill of rights. This government refused that. Maybe the government had all of this in mind and that is why it refused. At least the government is consistent on that score. Let us recognize the government's consistency in one area at least. On one hand they did not want to acknowledge in the charter of rights, the right to private property and on the other they were planning to deny it in this legislation.

● (2130)

What has my party done to try to remodel this amendment and to make it a little more acceptable? The amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson) is aimed, first of all, at safeguarding Canadian development enterprise in the north from this conscienceless brigandry through legislation. As the legislation now stands, this back-in and the claim of 25 per cent applies to Canadian enterprise or any other kind of enterprise, all in the name of Canadianization. They are breaking contract with their own people. It is one thing perhaps to try to do that with non-Canadian investment, but to do it to Canadians, I think, is absolutely deplorable.

The manner in which we have managed to safeguard that is in the motion which reads:

Her Majesty in right of Canada is hereby vested with and the Minister on Her behalf shall hold a share sufficient to render the interest holder with a Canadian Ownership Rate of 50 per cent.

That says that if the enterprise is 100 per cent Canadian owned now, there is no need whatsoever for the Canadian

Canada Oil and Gas Act

government to back in. Yet these people sit mutely by and are prepared to see their Canadian colleagues conned out of 25 per cent of their enterprise. I suggest the government is guilty of hypocrisy in this aspect of its operation.

Let us look at amendment No.2 standing in the name of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). That really is quite an interesting piece of reading because we see there in advance a declaration of principles. Let me just cite it because it is relevant to the amendment I am talking about, although we have not as yet dealt with this particular one. The declaration of principles states that it is recognized that it is "in the national interest to advance national economic and social interests through control by Canadians of their own energy future," and that "Canadians must be offered an opportunity to participate in the development of their energy future and to share in the benefits of that development."

Those are laudable principles, but how you can reconcile that statement of principles by backing in on a 100 per cent Canadian enterprise, claiming you are doing it in the interest of Canadianization, I just do not understand. And I bet you my bottom dollar there is not one person over there who can explain it either, not one. They have no concept of the outrageousness that is before us.

Combining these two highflown phrases, with the powers in this bill to confiscate retroactively 25 per cent of a 100 per cent Canadian enterprise is, to my way of thinking, the epitome of 1984 double talk, not to mention unmitigated hypocrisy and doubledealing. It might be understandable to some, in light of that pious enunciation of principles, to see the government confiscate 25 per cent of non-Canadian enterprise—that might be understandable—but those who can stomach such confiscation and such piracy from their own kind must, at this time, be prepared to see business contracts violated and the government's word broken, because these enterprises were enticed into developing productive resources by generous tax credits and the forgiveness of some of their expenses. They were never told that, in addition, they were going to be liable to seizure by the state once they had found proven reserves.

To pass this legislation in its present form would be to legalize piracy, and my party cannot stand for such a blatant repudiation of an original trust.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the House are aware of what the government is asking them to do, because, in the briefest terms, this amounts to legitimizing larceny. For those who do not understand what larceny is I would like to quote from the Concise Oxford Dictionary. It is:

—felonious taking away of another's personal goods with intent to convert them to one's own use.

If I have a few moments left, I think it is now worth examining the consequences of this form of larceny. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) listed some of them this evening when he was speaking, including the flight of enterprise from this country to the United States, the transfer of development funds by Canadian firms from Canada to the United States, with all that means in terms of decreased