

go cap in hand to Ottawa and so that they do not have to rely on the charity of central Canada, as we in the west do not have to do that any more. I would like to see Atlantic Canada in that position. They need a good resource base. That is why the provinces must have primary claim and ownership over their offshore resources.

Ownership is a bundle of rights. There are many things involved in ownership. For example, it does not mean that the federal government will be completely cut out. The federal government has control over shipping, fisheries, and defence, and certainly it has a strong claim to environmental control and protection in the coastal areas. Basically, the government must recognize—and it is not recognizing it by waving this red flag before the bull—that at some point it must make an agreement with respect to offshore resources. Perhaps this might be better dealt with in the constitution committee, but I raise it at this point anyway.

I wanted to say one special word on my own behalf before I go on to another matter with respect to the environment. It is very important that in this bill and in the committee we go into some detail about the northern environment. It is our last frontier, our last environment. I have been there and I have seen the incredible environment in the Beaufort Sea and the Mackenzie Delta. I do not want to see it spoiled. I think we can have oil and gas production there. I think it can be done, but it has to be done carefully.

I draw hon. member's attention to a speech given by Sam Raddi of Inuvik, Northwest Territories. I will not read it into the record. It is a speech he gave on January 28, 1976, to the Berger commission. What Sam Raddi said was that "for generations we have been told that as go the animals so go us. If the animals, the fish and the whales of the Beaufort Sea and the surrounding area, ever disappear, then we will disappear, the Eskimo people will disappear." That is a thing which we cannot see happening in Canada. That is why we must go very carefully in the area of environmental protection.

I want to discuss one further aspect of Canadianization. I spoke in the House on November 21, and in response to my speech I received a letter from a Mr. Conrad M. Black, who is the chairman of the executive committee for a small company in Toronto called Hollinger Argus Limited, located at 10 Toronto Street. Since Mr. Black did not agree with some of the things I said about Canadianization, and it pertains to what I am saying now, I will read the letter into the record. I do so because the minister also got a copy of the letter. It certainly is not a confidential letter. Mr. Black wanted a chance to respond to some of the statements I had made. He said:

Dear Mr. Waddell:

I have read with some astonishment your reference to me on page 4955 of *Hansard*, reporting your comments in the House of Commons on November 21, 1980. The statement, "We will simply replace the Rockefellers with the Conrad Blacks or the Bob Blairs", is so demonstrably untrue that I cannot allow it to pass without comment.

I believe it is well known to the government and to the official opposition that I, personally, support the announced objectives of Canadianizing the energy industry, according the federal government a greater fiscal benefit from the

operations of that industry, and maintaining Canadian energy prices somewhat below the world price level.

I digress there. I know that the government has the support of the chairman, at least in respect of Argus. So much for their radical policy. I continue reading from the letter:

I part company, however, with the authors of the National Energy Program in so far as that program, if it is not amended, will increase Canada's strategic dependence upon foreign energy sources rather than reducing it and will go a long way toward strangling the domestic private sector in the energy industry, while inflicting serious unemployment and a loss of technological skills upon both eastern and western Canada in the aftermath of the departure of the megaprojects; nor do I, as a citizen, feel that the public interest is particularly well served by gratuitously antagonizing even the most patriotic and least self-serving elements of the private sector, as this budget and energy program and official reaction to criticism of it have tended to do.

He parts company and joins my friends to the right. I am used to that, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but, it being five o'clock, there is now other business with which we must proceed.

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I will finish reading the letter and give my reply to it later this evening.

\* \* \*

● (1700)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills, to which the concurrence of the House is desired:

Bill S-16, an act respecting the President of the Lethbridge Stake of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

Bill S-18, an act to amend and repeal an act to incorporate General Security Insurance Company of Canada; and

Bill S-10, an act to amend the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act.

Further, I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following Bills:

Bill C-47, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1981; and

Bill C-49, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1981.