

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

tried to deny it in a motion. They have tried to change it in a motion. Now they are trying to really interfere with it and to fetter it.

That is why I do not have any problem in opposing this particular motion on behalf of my party. It is not a question of holding Petro-Canada executives accountable and saying that one is in favour of holding them accountable. The hon. member should check *Hansard* and the record of the meetings of the committee on freedom of information at which I suggested that freedom of information laws should be expanded to Crown corporations including Petro-Canada. I hope he will support that. I have cross-examined the president of Petro-Canada in committee. I had some hard questions to ask him. I have never cross-examined the president of Exxon. I would like to but I will never have the chance to do so.

**Mr. Taylor:** Take a chance.

**Mr. Thacker:** Buy a share.

**Mr. Waddell:** I hear the seals slapping. They are suggesting that I should buy a share of Exxon and attend meetings in Houston or New York in order to cross-examine the president. Nevertheless, I have no objection to the principle that those who are directing and running Petro-Canada should be held accountable. I do not think anyone in the House opposes that principle. If the hon. member needs the support of a mean type of socialist, then I agree with it. But he should not smear us with red-baiting nonsense.

The real intent of this motion is to fetter Petro-Canada. I suggest to hon. members on my right that they should take a look at Motion No. 24 in the name of the hon. member for Nunatsiak (Mr. Ittinuar). It was ruled out of order because a part at the end referred to the transfer of money. The hon. member for Nunatsiak said that we should talk about Petro-Canada or a Crown corporation holding some of that 25-per cent back-in for the benefit of native people who will come along and ultimately have land claims. Also we hope that ultimately there will be a settlement of land claims. Why was the government not prepared to do that? Why was the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) not prepared to support that? Where were Conservative members when I tried to hold up the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works on this bill, on the basis of trying to win some rights for the native people of the north? They were supporting the Liberals in committee. Let us not have hypocrisy here; let us talk about the real thing.

Hon. members might have a look at the motion of the hon. member for Nunatsiak. He indicated what really could be done with that 25 per cent interest. I suggest to hon. members across the way, such as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), that they take a look at some of the later amendments to the bill from Mr. Ittinuar which in fact would help native people.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Order, please. I remind the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) that

he must refer to hon. members by using the names of the constituencies, not their names.

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, of course you are correct. I was referring to their names as printed on the motions appearing on the Order Paper. They are followed by their constituency names.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** As long as they are members of the House I maintain that they should be referred to by their constituency names, not by the name written on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Waddell:** I am just a new member of the House. I have to learn these rules.

**An hon. Member:** You are also a slow member of the House.

**Mr. Waddell:** Perhaps the hon. member for Calgary Centre would find more enjoyment in the British Columbia legislature. Perhaps he should look also at Motion No. 25. It contains a reference to arbitration in Clause 31(3). This is a further delaying tactic, a further fetter on the Crown's share. There is a further reference to Section 56 which is an appeal system to the federal court. This is the Conservatives standing up for their friends, the most profitable industry in Canada, the oil industry. Basically they are standing up for a foreign-controlled industry, the most heavily subsidized industry. They are trying to put a fetter on Petro-Canada. Petro-Canada is popular in the country. They should have learned this in the last election. They are fighting the last war, they are fighting a rearguard battle.

I think my comments summarize the reasons we on this side of the House do not feel we should support this hypocritical motion.

**Mr. Bill Wright (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, we are discussing Motion No. 25 tonight. It is basically an amendment to Clause 31, a clause which directs the government to transfer the 25 per cent confiscation to a designated Crown corporation. Basically, that is all it says, that the government may transfer its 25 per cent ownership in a discovery to a Crown corporation. All that must happen is that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) give notice to the oil company that he is converting the government's free ride on a successful well into a working interest. In other words, during all the exploration on the Canada lands and every time an oil company makes a discovery, the government notifies it that the free ride is over and that it must be prepared to pay its way.

● (2120)

Motion No. 25 which would amend Clause 31 of the bill, suggests that when the government transfers its share to a designated Crown corporation—and we must emphasize here that many people believe that automatically means Petro-Canada but that is not the case; any number of Crown corporations can be designated and we do not know how many will be—it automatically becomes a working interest at what-