

Canada Oil and Gas Act

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have a captive audience opposite, but I have only a few minutes in which to start this speech on the Canadianization part of the bill.

Generally speaking, this government has been a disaster in the last couple of years. The only bright spot that the public thought it could see was Canadianization. In my speech tomorrow and the speeches of some of my colleagues, we shall show what Canadianization is. It is a bit of a sham because the public thinks it is public ownership. It is not, Mr. Speaker; it is changing the big boys—the Rockefellers and the big American boys—to big Canadian boys, the Domes, the Novas and so on. In the course of my speech, I will show how Canadians will suffer once again as a result of this. They will put up the money for exploration and development, and it will go into a few private pockets. Instead of American pockets, it will go into the Canadian industry's pockets but not into the pockets of the people.

Mr. Evans: Not true.

Mr. Waddell: I would ask the hon. member opposite to read the bill and then come here tomorrow and listen to my speech on Canadianization.

The Canadianization requirements are simply empty promises, Mr. Speaker. Under this bill, the control of our oil industry, which is still 75 per cent foreign controlled—

Mr. Gray: Sixty-seven per cent.

Mr. Waddell: We will talk about that tomorrow and I will give the figures then. In 1974, the government promised that it would take the country to 50 per cent Canadian control and ownership. It promised that again in 1979 and in 1980, and we will likely hear it again in 1981.

In my speech I will make the point that the taxation and carried interest provisions of the bill do not reflect the schemes found elsewhere in the world today. In Norway, the state-owned company receives 50 per cent to 80 per cent carried interest versus the proposed 25 per cent carried interest proposed for Petro-Canada. Great Britain and Norway both impose taxes double or triple those contained in Bill C-48.

In my speech I will show that once again we are the suckers when compared to the regime in Norway, Great Britain, even Australia and Mexico. I will deal with each of those regimes and show how ours compares.

I shall also show in some detail what will happen as the result of this bill. I shall suggest that in the stock market we will see a lot of small Canadian companies that will be shells for foreign multinational oil companies. The bill provides for grants of 93 cents on every dollar. Just think of it, Mr. Speaker, you get 93 cents from the taxpayer to drill in the north, in the Canada lands, the west coast, east shore and offshore.

Talk about wealth; my friends to the right talk about capitalism. There is no capitalism here; it is simply government largesse. The government will pay 93 cents out of every dollar required to drill, but will we get public ownership for

that? No, just a limited public ownership through Petro-Canada. Dome and Nova and all the other corporations will be made rich, and the Canadian taxpayer will pay. I shall show all that in my speech, Mr. Speaker.

I ask hon. members opposite the name of the largest oil company in Canada. Is it Petro-Canada? No, it is Dome Petroleum. Let us admit that Canadianization is not public ownership. It will rip off—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICE—COST OF LIVING DIFFERENTIALS APPLICABLE
TO AIRPORT FIREMEN

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, on July 15 I rose in the House to ask a question of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston). I was speaking on behalf of some of my constituents, the firemen at the Vancouver International Airport. They are concerned about the strength of their position in bargaining for a wage settlement in a bargaining unit comprised of maybe 20, 30 or 40 people.

The government's position as the employer is that national unions represent national employees across Canada. The minister admitted to me in the House at that time that this does create a problem of disparity for employees. I pointed out to him that whenever you have equality on a national scale, you have a high level of unfairness for the employees. Local conditions in each area of the country vary so much that a national agreement creates benefits for one area and problems for another area. For example, wage scales of the firemen at the Vancouver International Airport compare very unfavourably with those of their fellow employees in New Brunswick. In some parts of the country, employees have a wage scale of \$3,000 a year more than their counterparts either in the local city or the provincial fire departments. On the other hand, the firemen at the Vancouver International Airport are paid about \$6,000 a year less than their counterparts in downtown Vancouver or those who work for the provincial government.

The employees at the Vancouver International Airport are paid the same as those in Moncton, but the cost of living in the two areas is astronomically different. I do not know how the President of the Treasury Board can work for an agreement which is supposed to be equal when it is incredibly unfair.

He admitted in his answer to me that it is unfair and that the government is trying to work out regional benefits for some