

industry, even by segments of the government of the United States on behalf of the oil industry, to get this bill amended, watered down and changed so that the industry can continue its beneficial regime of past years.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you could take a look at an article which was written in 1973 by Professor Andrew Thompson, entitled, "Canada's Petroleum Leasing Policy—A Cornucopia For Whom?". The criticisms in that article were really the beginnings of this bill. It referred to a regime which was pretty easy on the oil companies. We virtually gave away our leases in the north, with no time limit, with no concern for whether they should be developed once they were given, with no concern for what was happening up there in the area of industrial spin-offs.

**An hon. Member:** The Canadians would not take it.

**Mr. Waddell:** I am not referring to the Canadians who would not take it. We gave it to people who could afford to do it. At that time it was foreign capital. It is true that a lot of Canadians would not do it. Perhaps they did not see the benefits, but they do now. I do not think we should make a similar mistake. There was relentless pressure to water down the bill, and the government has watered it down. Instead of strengthening the bill, the government has watered it down. I know that the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) wants to put forward the interests of his friends in the oil industry, and that is fine. On this side of the House we are prepared to listen to those claims if they are reasonable. In the past they have not been.

● (2150)

A few minutes ago I heard the hon. member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) speak about the tar sands. But he did not know anything about the tar sands. He talked about private enterprise in the tar sands. The government has offered the people who are developing the tar sands world price for their oil, but they have said that they want more. They always want more, more. That was even too much for the Premier of Alberta. Apparently it was not too much for the Conservative party, but it was too much for the Premier of Alberta who finally threw up his hands and said it was too much.

The government has backed off this bill very substantially. It backed off by changing the Petro-Canada "back in" somewhat. It backed off from the original draft by changing the Canadian content requirement because it was too tough in the original draft. It backed off the royalty holidays to the industry. In a few days we will get to all these items where the government has backed off. It backed off slightly in this section by changing the term to eight years. I suggest that the government ought not to back off any further, Mr. Speaker. That term should be kept at five years. I know what my friend, the hon. parliamentary secretary, will say. His speech will be to the effect that this is the difference between the Liberals and the NDP—the Liberals are for eight years, the NDP is for five years, and the Tories are for ten years. He thinks he has the radical middle now, but I would call it the muddled

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

middle. That will be the tenor of his speech, so he does not have to make it.

I say that we should not back off any further on any of these clauses. We have already backed off far enough and we should keep this clause as it is.

**Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) suggested that since his party takes the position that the duration should be five years and the Conservative party spokesman proposed ten years, and since the Liberal party suggests eight years, that I would be satisfied with the legislation as it stands. He is right. The normal term under an exploration agreement in Bill C-48 is five years, with the provision that the minister may grant an extension to eight years if he considers that exceptional circumstances warrant it. In our view, the ten-year term proposed is too long to permit a holder of an agreement to have the right to explore on Canada lands without the scrutiny that would be involved in renegotiations. We recognize, however, that there will be occasions when the particular circumstances require an extension. It is for that purpose that we have provided for the possibility of an additional three years, for a total of eight years. We believe that this is sufficient time to permit exploration to go forward. We certainly want to avoid the situation which has occurred in the past where companies with exploration rights have not taken the initiative in developing those rights for the benefit of the Canadian people.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 14 (Mr. Wilson) negatived.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway)** moved:

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-48, an act to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 8 to 10 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"rated in Canada and be Canadian-controlled and have Canadian ownership rate of not less than fifty (50) per cent in 1981, fifty-five (55) per cent in 1982, sixty (60) per cent in 1983, sixty-five (65) per cent in 1984, seventy (70) per cent in 1985, and a minimum Canadian ownership rate of seventy-five (75) per cent in 1986 and so on; or".