

Canada Oil and Gas Act

in industrial activity will have an impact on employment. This is already evident in the western provinces.

The Economic Council of Canada forecast a healthy and vigorous energy industry which would lead to 750,000 jobs in Canada during the 1980s. Loss of energy investment will result in almost 1 per cent higher unemployment and a 1 per cent loss per year in economic growth.

Earlier this year I read into the record a list of eastern Canadian firms which have been affected by the National Energy Program through loss of orders. I will go through the amounts in a moment. I also read the list of Alberta suppliers affected by the National Energy Program. How can the government possibly say this program is good for Canada? Rigs are leaving, money is leaving and there are cutbacks in investment. Dozens of firms are losing contracts. Eastern Canadian industries who are suppliers for most of the oil industry in Alberta are being devastated by cutbacks or cancellation of purchases. According to a survey in Alberta to which 41 companies responded, \$1,470,000 in revenue was lost by eastern suppliers in the last quarter of 1980. The forecast cutbacks to eastern suppliers in 1981 will amount to approximately \$20 million. In the same survey, loss of revenue to Alberta suppliers amounted to approximately \$2,500,000 in 1980. In 1981, revenue losses are expected to be approximately \$30 million. This is from a survey of only a small segment of the oil industry in Alberta. This is why we are so concerned about the energy minister having discretionary powers, or any power at all.

It is my hope the government will reconsider these discretionary powers. No minister of the Crown should have such dictatorial powers, especially the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources with his record in the energy field. I hope the government will reconsider and support the motions placed on the Order Paper by the Conservative Party with regard to this legislation.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my party I would like to wind up the debate on these particular motions which, as I have said before, is perhaps the third part of this bill. It is a lengthy bill, but if you divide it into four parts it is not that complicated. The first part concerns the effect of oil and gas development on the north and native northerners. A number of motions deal with that aspect.

The second part concerns the environment and there are a number of motions directed to that as well. We have dealt with both those areas.

Third, there is industrial strategy—or lack thereof—in the bill, the Canadian content provisions, industrial spin-offs, the area which my hon. friend from Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) thoroughly dealt with this afternoon. We are just winding up that part now.

Then we will turn to the fourth section of this bill which, in my classification, is the whole area of Canadianization, all the grants and the role of Petro-Canada in what I call the phony Canadianization. We will have a number of speakers address-

ing this part of the legislation to get our message to the country.

I call this bill a sleeper. I expect to hear some hecklers saying that I am putting them to sleep. The minister of energy is here and he is already asleep. The bill is a sleeper in the sense that the issues involved are the real issues in modern Canada today, issues such as native land claims, the environment in the south and the north, east and west coast exploration and development, industrial spin-offs, industrial strategy, relations with the Americans with respect to Canadianization and the role of Petro-Canada, public enterprise and private enterprise and the way we will develop the north, that vast storeland of materials of which Frank Scott, the poet, once said: "It is silently awaiting the struggle". He wrote that almost 30 years ago or perhaps earlier, and now the struggle has begun. That is why this bill is important.

● (1640)

Let me say something about an industrial strategy. In our motion we have chosen to set out what the industrial strategy should be. In other words, we have chosen to set out some specifics about getting some Canadian content. To use the words of the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis), we have chosen to put some teeth into it so that Canadian business and in particular, as the hon. member said, small business—for which the hon. member is a real fighter in this House—can get some benefits.

The Conservatives have proposed some amendments. I will not go into the detail of those amendments. By and large they are vague and put in as a response to the thrust of our amendments in the committee.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Waddell: That is true. We were the ones who presented amendments to the committee. We held the committee up. We filibustered in the committee and we make no apologies for that. We did that to try to obtain benefits for Canadian business. Where were the Conservatives? Nowhere. They even co-operated with the Liberals in order to end the committee debate. Just look at the committee record; it is all there.

The Liberals are showing signs of backing off with respect to the Canadian content provisions. If we look at the original draft of this bill and the amendments brought in by the minister in the committee, we see that the minister was a little afraid of American pressure and, in fact, changed the provisions of the bill and made them more vague and more behind the scenes rather than up front. I will come to the reasons for that in a moment, but I suggest this is a mistake.

Mr. McDermid: He has never been up front in his life.

Mr. Waddell: I want to deal with some of the amendments, first of all Motion No. 7. Motion No. 7 is a motion put down by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), formerly the Conservative energy critic but now the finance critic. We are opposed to that motion, mainly because of its reference to Clause 56 in the bill. Clause 56 refers to court