

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to make a few comments on the serious and damaging aspects that Clause 27 of the Canadian Oil and Gas Act carries for the future of this country. I would also like to take the opportunity to express some of the deep concerns that we in the west have about this type of legislation.

An hon. Member: We are on Motion No. 21.

Mr. Huntington: I wish the member knew what he was talking about. We are on Clause 27 and are speaking to Motions Nos. 21 and 22.

It is obvious I will have another night of interruptions, but I think I will be able to handle them. My colleague, the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson), as reported at page 12227 of *Hansard*, has once again given the House and the country a most thoroughly researched and ominous warning of the difficulties we are facing in Clause 27. This so-called Canadianization clause is, in truth, a nationalization clause. The hon. member for Calgary South pointed out in his warning that under this clause of the act we are likely to experience a daily shortfall of oil in the order of 1.1 million barrels per day by 1990. This clause will not provide Canadians with energy self-sufficiency by 1990, but it will give us the potential of that kind of an import need. He also pointed out, as did my colleague from Red Deer (Mr. Towers), the disastrous attrition that has taken place within our exploration abilities since the combination of Clause 27 of the Canada Oil and Gas Act and the constitutional package were delivered to this country.

Today we have two great freedom bells ringing. We have the charter of rights, and we have the Canadianization of our oil and gas industry as called for under Clause 27 of this bill.

This freedom clarion has the depth, morality and sincerity of the big red L and the big red maple leaf ink stain. It is a red blot that is smothering the history and evolution of Canadian morality. Canadianization, as it is meant in this clause of the bill, is in effect confiscation. It is theft and it is piracy. I do not see any other definition for it.

I never thought I would live to see this kind of act passed on the North American continent. Canadianization, as it is meant by the Liberal government, is nationalism. The bill as it stands now allows the government to take 25 per cent ownership of only the winners, without cost. I repeat, only the winners. There is no obligation for the government or for the Crown corporation to share in the cost of the dry holes or the tremendous front-end exploration costs that precede all drilling activities. This bill allows the Crown corporation access to all the intellectual property that the private sector has so dearly paid for over the years.

The New Democratic Party is not satisfied with the devastation of the 25 per cent back-in clause which the government has proposed. It wants to create absolute havoc by increasing this to 50 per cent in their Motion No. 22. If Motion No. 22

Canada Oil and Gas Act

were accepted, it would bring all activity in the frontier to a halt.

In the mid-1970s this country had an opportunity to achieve full employment and oil self-sufficiency by the 1990s. We have lost that opportunity. A generation of young people who came out of our school system, anxious to carve a spot for themselves in Canadian life, have been denied this opportunity because of the deliberate interference of the government in the marketplace.

I have had to ask myself many times why we have had this succession of policies which have interfered with the opportunity for full employment which this country was blessed with. I believe the answer is in this bill. It is in the Canadianization aspect of this clause. It is also in the New Democratic Party Motion No. 22 in which they want to lift the back-in threshold to 50 per cent.

My colleague, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson) moved motion No. 21 which merely states:

"(2) 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",

Never has this party done other than agree with the objectives as presented by the government in the Canada Oil and Gas Act. The first objective rings beautifully: energy self-sufficiency. Why, then, does it do everything it can to prevent participation by Canadians? What a misleading twist that is. We are talking about state ownership, not participation by Canadians.

The other stated objectives of this bill are fair pricing and revenue sharing, but that is not what is being delivered. What is being delivered is a policy that has caused many of us in this country great and deep anguish.

Socialism cannot be imposed from the top down. It has to be a grass roots movement from the bottom up. It is not possible to create the social unrest necessary to bring about a socialist state if people are working and the economy is healthy.

Of all the countries in the world, Mr. Speaker, Canada is the one which could make a major donation to the Third World by stopping our reliance on non-renewable energy sources from abroad. Since 1976 we could have been fully employed by moving from the Syncrude plant all that engineering and labour and skill capacity over into another Alsands plant. We could have been building the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, which would have sent that energy locked in the north down to our neighbour in the south who pays the military bill which gives us our cloak of freedom. We could have been phasing in one megaproject after another. Cold Lake, which was going to be in place and on which great sums of money had been spent—and individual people like you and I, Mr. Speaker, had moved in to invest in that growth opportunity—is dead. It lies dead and cold. We could have built pipelines for gas to the maritimes and Quebec as an oil substitute. Why were these things not started in the mid 1970s? We could have moved to replace oil with gas. We did not. We could have been energy self-sufficient by 1990. We could have stopped the drain on world resources. We could