

Government Orders

really turned around yet despite what the government may suggest in the various budgets, and the increased, we hope, impetus due to this legislation which hopefully will be passed today.

• (1650)

It is in the nation's best interest to take this step. Clearly I would because I would not be here speaking about it otherwise. What implication would selling a stake in the industry have?

An hon. member: Capital exports.

Mr. Mifflin: Capital exports or some people may say exploitation or sellout. Frankly I do not see the weight on that side of the issue.

If I could summarize, we in the Liberal Party are sympathetic to the need for new capital in the oil industry. I believe it is needed.

I would do no less if it were required in the fisheries industry to alleviate the massive lay-off in Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada. It would be hypocritical of me to stand up and not to speak in favour of this bill because essentially all we are doing is applying the same principle which unfortunately cannot be applied in this total sense to the fishery industry.

I would like to see the government take functional jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the bank. That is what I would consider to be equivalent to the measures that are being proposed by this bill.

The bill is essentially saying that yes, there are risks in taking this action. But we are taking the risk to reduce the restrictions on foreign investment in this industry because we feel that on balance it will help the industry.

In the case of the fishery industry, the same risk pertains. If we announce functional jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the bank beyond the 200-mile limit, we may have some difficulty in trading with Spain and Portugal, which is in the vicinity of about \$175 million. It may affect other industries and we may have difficulties with maritime law at the international law courts in Geneva. We have had two emergency debates in this House on the subject and my colleagues and I believe that the risk is worth the gain.

I want the government to take note that the Liberal Party is prepared to take the risk in the case of the part

of the world that relies on the oil and gas industry. I would counsel them to take the same kind of risk in the few days remaining in this Parliament for the fishery in Newfoundland with respect to functional jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks and to stop foreign fishermen from taking the resources that Newfoundlanders are not allowed to use themselves right now.

In summary, I believe that given the circumstances and the need for the oil and gas industry to get out of the slump it is in, we support this bill. I look forward to any other comments that people may have with respect to the risk and the balance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the hon. member, I have received written notice from the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap that he is unable to move his motion during private members' hour on Monday, June 14, 1993.

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 94(2)(a). Accordingly, I am directing the table officers to drop the item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence. Private members' hour will thus be cancelled and pursuant to Standing Order 99(2) the House will meet to consider Government Orders at 11 o'clock a.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to speak in support of Bill C-106, which in my opinion is an extremely important piece of legislation. It is, in fact, an economic development tool for the Canadian petroleum industry.

I also want to allay the fears raised by my NDP colleague that this legislation will cause an outflow of capital to other countries and that Canadians will no longer be free to develop their own oil industry as they see fit.

What the bill says is quite straightforward: The 50 per cent Canadian ownership requirement will no longer apply. But on the other hand, the bill says that only a corporation incorporated in Canada may hold a production licence or share in a production licence.