

their infamous National Energy Program did not grandfather the resource to before March, 1982. Yet now the Liberals are calling for retroactivity in the energy industry. I thought they learned their lesson. They alienated the west and the energy industry by retroactivity, and now my friend from Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) has instituted a new Liberal energy policy. I want that marked down in the books today. There is a new Liberal energy policy. They want retroactivity to go beyond 1982. We are opposed to that.

I should not go any further than that, but I might point out to the Hon. Member that before 1982 all oil companies under the Canada Oil and Gas Land regulations were subject to Canadian ownership regulations. Who brought those in? They have been in existence since 1960 and were brought in by the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker. The Conservative Government of that time was talking about Canadian ownership. That Government brought in those regulations and they are still in effect for pre-1982 discoveries. Even the Liberal Government respected that when it brought in the NEP. That was one of the few things it did respect in the energy sector. I am surprised, and I am sure those people out west will be very, very surprised, to see the Liberals talking not only about back-ins and confiscation, but now wanting to go back before 1982 and do some more confiscating. Well, we say nay to such nonsense.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member mentioned John George Diefenbaker. The poor man would be spinning in his grave if he knew what the Conservatives have done to Canadianization. He was a great spokesman for Canada and Canadianization. He had to make some difficult decisions in order to stand up for Canada. Yet look at the modern Conservative Party. They just folded the National Energy Program and in this Bill they are getting rid of the back-in provisions. They are in fact caving in to pressure from Uncle Sam. I am surprised that the statute of John George Diefenbaker in front of this building is not spinning while I say this. I think the Parliamentary Secretary is on shaky ground when he evokes the memory of the former Hon. Member for Prince Albert.

He was also on shaky ground earlier when he said to the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) that this Act does not apply to British Columbia. I did not quite understand that because frontier lands are defined as land belonging to Her Majesty in right of Canada, and refers to Yukon, the Northwest Territories, and those submarine areas not within a province and adjacent to the coast of Canada.

Mr. McDermid: Not within a province.

Mr. Waddell: Is that the policy of the Government, that British Columbia gets everything out there?

Mr. McDermid: Not within a province.

Mr. Waddell: I would like to get that on the record. Does that mean—

Canada Petroleum Resources Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. Is the Hon. Member addressing the Chair? If he wishes an answer, I wish he would go through the Chair; he might then get an answer.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am going through the Chair. I hope at some point later in the debate the Hon. Member will clarify his remarks. I find that to be an absolutely extraordinary statement.

In any case, I want to support my friend from Cape Breton—The Sydneys on this particular provision.

Mr. McDermid: Read it again.

Mr. Waddell: I want to re-emphasize the fact that this is not an energy policy. This is a regime for future drilling if it ever comes about. Not only that, it is a regime to once again sell out. It is like turning the clock back to an old regime in which we gave Canadian resources to foreigners. I call it back to the future. We allowed ourselves to be exploited in the worst possible sense of the term. In my view we did not even deserve to be thought of as much of a country because we did not have the guts to control and develop our own resources. In his remarks my friend from Cape Breton was hinting at this line of argument as well. I will have more to say on other amendments.

• (1520)

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I also listened carefully to the interventions of the Parliamentary Secretary on Clause 53 in Part V of the Bill with regard to Canadian ownership. In his intervention he did not take into account that four years have gone by since 1982 and that the situation which has emerged warrants the intervention of my colleague requesting that Clause 53, which is virtually the main pillar of Part V, be struck out.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth): Nonsense.

Mr. Caccia: The Parliamentary Secretary says “nonsense”. The fact that we want to ensure 50 per cent ownership of Canadian oil and gas can be described more charitably than as “nonsense”. This is of public and national interest. In the light of what developed in the last four years I would like to draw to his attention the fact that this clause has merit, regardless of what was debated in 1982. We now have a different set of circumstances and are, more than ever, anxious to establish Canadian ownership of our oil and gas resources.

Without Clause 53, Part V loses its muscle and thrust. This is the engine of the entire Canadian ownership theme. My colleague's motion requests that Clause 53 be deleted in order to give some muscle and impact to the section of the Bill entitled Canadian Ownership.

The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary can look to the past to find some strength for his counterargument. Today the Government of Canada must develop its policy for 1986. Our major concern and preoccupation must be to ensure the largest