Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to it while you are doing that. It is a perfect example of how the Conservatives approached this Bill. Every point the industries asked for, the industries got; every point the native people asked for, the native people were turned down. Every time environmentalists ask for something, they are turned down. We can look at the record. This is a perfect example. Now there is a bit too much paperwork for the companies. For the native people, it is their land and their lives, and look what the Conservatives do. They are disgusting. They deserve to be tossed out. We will oppose this amendment and vote against it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Since this is an amendment to the Bill, in order to get around all the paperwork, I would appreciate it if the House would allow the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Gagnon) to withdraw the amendment the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Gagnon) and substitute the amendment of the Hon. Member for Calgary South. Is that agreeable?

Mr. Gagnon: Agreeable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): So agreed.

Motion No. 12 (Mr. Gagnon) withdrawn.

Mrs. Sparrow: On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker-

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I will put the amendment by the Hon. Member for Calgary North first.

Mr. Paul Gagnon (Calgary North) moved:

That Bill C-5, be amended in Clause 85 by striking out line 26 at page 43 and substituting the following therefor:

"terms and conditions or, on the request of the Minister, a copy of the agreement or arrangement".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Therefore, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Canada Petroleum Resources Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-5, be amended in Clause 112 by striking out lines 1 to 5 at page 63.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should not have become emotional about the last matter, but it really is striking. I just cannot believe how the Government could be so insensitive to the people who live in the north. It is astounding.

My Motion No. 13 attempts to amend subclause 112(3) at page 63 of the Bill. Presently the subclause reads:

All rights of Petro-Canada to acquire further interests or shares in interests as a result of the operation of Section 33, 120 or 121 of the *Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations* are abrogated as of March 5, 1982.

One of the most important points of the Bill is that it abolishes the Crown share, the 25 per cent back-in provision which gave the Government of Canada, the people of Canada, the right to acquire an interest in petroleum finds that proved commercially viable, in recognition of the burden assumed by Canadian taxpayers in the promotion of exploration and development of Canadian frontier resources. This burden remains because the Conservatives are to eliminate PIP grants and bring in a tax credit policy.

In committee we found that from 1980 to 1987 something like \$7.1 billion was advanced in terms of PIP grants. I know money was also taxed from the industry, but the fact is that \$7.1 billion was advanced for frontier exploration. The former Minister of Energy, the Hon. Marc Lalonde, appeared before a previous energy committee. I should like to paraphrase what he said at the time. He said that another \$4 billion or \$5 billion was in fact advanced to the energy industry by tax advantages, the famous super depletion allowances, and so on, in the period between 1960 and 1980. We are looking at somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10 billion to \$12 billion which went to the energy industry to drill in the frontiers of Canada.

Of course the irony is that, just as that policy was proving to be a little successful, in the sense of a good well in the Beaufort Sea, in the offshore of Newfoundland, in the Grand Bank, and in the Venture field in Nova Scotia, the whole thing is now collapsing with the low price of world oil. It was a tremendous investment.

The large multinational oil companies represented by the Canadian Petroleum Association and by the Government of the United States, the two lobby groups representing them, harped, lobbied, threatened, and cajoled the Government to Canada to remove this 25 per cent back-in. The matter went to the highest levels. The President of the United States at the Shamrock Summit in Quebec City pressed the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mulroney). We had the Government of the United States and the Canadian Petroleum Association, especially the Canadian Petroleum Association, writing the