

Canada Oil and Gas Act

sector which is second to none in the world and which reflects the value of Canada's resource? No, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be found. For mining machinery we go to the United States, to Scandinavia, to Germany. We bring it in, we pay for it, we mine our ore, take it out and ship it away.

Then there is the forest industry, an industry second to none in the world, but do we have a substantial world-class leading edge forestry machinery manufacturing industry in this country? No, we do not.

Mr. Kelly: Yes.

Mr. Deans: Development could and should have taken place because this country was so fabulously rich in resources. At every turn we missed taking advantage of that for this generation and for future generations. Now we have been given another opportunity. Now we have again discovered that we are rich. We can be self-sufficient. But whose direction are we going to follow? Are we going to assure that in Canada there will be the development of the machinery that extracts from the ground and below the ocean? Are we going to make sure that a machinery manufacturing base is established in this country on a world scale? Are we going to take advantage of the tens of millions—of trillions—the Royal Bank says that it will be a trillion dollar expenditure—over the next 20 years? Does anyone have any idea of what a trillion dollars is? When you go to the bank to cash your cheque, can you imagine what a trillion dollars looks like, even spread over 20 years? I certainly cannot and most of my constituents cannot. But one thing I do know is that unless we take advantage of every opportunity to use that money to secure the economic well-being of this country for the next generation, we will once again have sold out our birthright.

● (2040)

That is what we are talking about in these amendments. That is exactly what these amendments speak to. We are talking about maximizing industrial benefit for Canadians. We are talking about maximizing employment opportunities, not only now but over the course of the development, by putting in place an industrial infrastructure, thus guaranteeing that we will be on the leading edge of technological change for the requirements of future generations. We are saying that as we tax Canadians, either through the tax structure or through the payment for the resource needed to heat their homes, to run their cars and to operate their businesses, by far the vast majority of those tax dollars should be used in Canada to provide Canadians with the kinds of opportunities that will secure the future of Canada.

That is what this is all about. That is why these amendments are here. We want to learn a lesson from the errors of the past. We want to learn, as my good friend from British Columbia has said to me many times, how to take advantage of mistakes made so as not to make them over and over again. We need not look back into our own history to see the errors. We need only look at the mistakes made in Scotland.

An hon. Member: They made a lot of mistakes like that.

Mr. Deans: That was not only when they let me leave. But when the North Sea oil was discovered, mistakes were made. The British had finally put their hands on energy self-sufficiency, but in their haste to take advantage of it, they found themselves losing out in terms of the economic benefit they might have reasonably obtained from the significant investment that had to be made.

The Economic Council of Canada, in a study of the North Sea oil development, points out that 60,000 jobs were created in Scotland in 1976. One hundred thousand jobs were created in Britain over all, but 200,000 jobs were created in the United States as a result of the North Sea find and the economic development resulting from the British taxpayers' investment in the development of the project.

Mr. McDermid: In Canada, too.

Mr. Deans: Are we going to do the same thing? Are we going to learn? It took some time, but the British finally twigged. They realized that they were paying out millions and millions of pounds, but the significant benefits from the project were flowing to other parts of the world.

In other words, the long-term benefits of economic and industrial development and the job opportunities that follow were flowing out of Britain. Therefore, the British offshore supply office was set up. That particular structure may not be entirely applicable in Canada, and in that connection I want to propose another one.

Mr. McCauley: Why don't you get to the bill?

Mr. Deans: It is interesting that the hon. member should ask that. It is an indication of a lack of understanding of what is contained in the legislation or of its import. However, I do not expect anything more or less.

Let me say that when the British finally understood what it was all about, they finally took steps to correct it.

What do we propose?

An hon. Member: Heaven knows!

Mr. Deans: I think the Liberals are feeling a little nervous tonight. I do not blame them. It has been through successive Liberal administrations that the rip-off has taken place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: It is because of that very narrow view of the future of the country that the country is in the present mess. I can appreciate the Liberals' embarrassment, but they should not compound it with their interjections.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: There are people in this country who have devoted a great deal of time, effort and energy in trying to come up with solutions. To a great extent, we have incorporated much of what these people have recommended in the amendments we placed before the House.