

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

What kind of free enterprise is that? It seems to me that this is a great rip-off of the Canadian taxpayer. That is exactly what this bill does. You do not have to believe me Mr. Speaker, because I will quote the words of the parliamentary secretary who said an hour ago in this House that "Canada has in place the most generous system of grants and incentives of any country." That is the kind of system that is being set up in this bill.

From 1977 to 1980 the federal Liberal party gave income tax breaks to the foreign-controlled resource sector worth a total of over \$13 billion, without getting any equity or ownership in return. Over the same period, income tax collected from the petroleum industry was only \$5 billion. What the NDP is saying and what we have said in our amendments to this bill, something that was ignored by the government which is not flexible at all, is that it is time the consumers and taxpayers of Canada who have funded the growth and profits of this industry get some ownership in return. If we are paying the piper, it is time we called the tune. We can only do that through majority public ownership.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that no one has spoken in French on Bill C-48. I thought all the provinces, including Quebec, had an interest in the energy issue. I have said that the Progressive Conservatives, the Tories in this House, were certainly speaking on behalf of the big oil companies in the course of the debate. Only the NDP spoke on behalf of the people. We support Petro-Canada. The Progressive Conservatives do not. We want Canadians to control the oil industry. That is definitely not the position of the Liberal Party.

[English]

Before I sit down, I should like to raise another point, and that is why I wanted to ask a question of the—

[Translation]

Mr. Cyr: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding a statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). He said that none of the francophone members took the floor during the debate. I want to say that this bill has been before the House for over a year, that it was sent to the committee where Quebec members took part in the study of the bill in committee and that we were in the House—

Mr. Waddell: The hon. member may wish to take part in the debate after me. I should like to hear the position of a member from Quebec, because I have not heard the position—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I did not recognize the point of order and I do not think the hon. member should have responded to it.

Mr. Waddell: Obviously the hon. member will have the chance to speak after I have completed my remarks and to set out his position on this bill. The hon. member cannot have it

both ways. Either the hon. member wants to speak on this and set out a position—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Again, I would invite the hon. member to address the Chair. I do not think the debate should be entertained across the floor.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the government and the parliamentary secretary specifically to respond to this matter of the effect of Bill C-48 on aboriginal land claims. I hope that the member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) will speak later on in this debate on this very point.

There are two points. First, the government says that this bill is neutral, to use the minister's words, toward aboriginal land rights. Our view is that the bill is not neutral. How can the bill be neutral if the government develops oil and gas resources quickly, as this bill proposes to do, and opens up a regime to do that? It is taking it off the bargaining table with the native people. That is a point on which the minister and I disagree. The minister suggests that he will bring in legislation after this bill is passed and we will have to look at it.

More specifically, I have in my hands a telegram from the Inuvialuit, the Inuit people near Inuvik. The telegram is from Sam Raddi, the President of COPE. In his telegram Mr. Raddi specifically challenges the government to include in a speech from one of the members of the Liberal party an undertaking that this bill will not affect a contract that was already entered into. I shall read a paragraph from Mr. Raddi's telegram. It reads:

To put the issue simply, do you agree that the intent and language of the agreement in principle—

—and that is the agreement with the Inuit—

—with respect to our 7 (1) (A) lands where there were encumbrances as of July 13, 1978 is that the Inuvialuit were to receive all of the Crown share, or to say it another way, we are to receive all of what the Crown would have received had they retained ownership in 7 (1) (A) lands. Yes or no. This is a fundamental and simple question that you should have no trouble in answering quickly. Should you agree with our statement with respect to the agreement in principle and if it is not your intention to alter that commitment in the agreement in principle you should have no difficulty in giving us your consent to the three commitments we requested on October 21, 1981.

The point is that this is a specific example of a bill actually affecting native rights which have already been negotiated. I challenge the government to answer the concerns of those people. If it cannot do that, it cannot say that this bill is neutral with regard to northern rights.

I want to conclude by saying that in this bill we, the NDP, have taken positions on environment, on industrial spin-offs, on Canadian content, and on protecting the rights of northerners. The government has not been responsive to these issues; but we have not lost the fight. That fight will continue. We will continue the fight in other ways and in other bills and in the areas that are affected.

I should like to say—I think this is where my friend, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) fell down—that what we have to do in this bill and in the energy policy is to nation build and to recapture for ourselves the ownership of