

Canada Oil and Gas Act

with the development of the east and west coasts by the federal government through the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. That is a department which wants to develop oil and gas. That is what it should be doing. It should not be the guardian of the environment. We need a balance. The Department of the Environment should be involved.

The previous speaker, of course, dealt with offshore resources. Again, a balance is needed in this area. The bill which is before us purports to take all the control of the offshore, the east and west coasts and the northern offshore, and give it to the federal government without really consulting the provinces, or even listening properly to the provinces or the northern government. We say that the ownership and management should be left to the provinces. I would like to deal with the east coast and the west coast to illustrate my point. The ownership, development and management should be left to the provinces. It is the same situation as that dealing with land. Perhaps I can explain the importance of this point to people who live in central Canada. I speak as someone who comes from a west coast constituency.

Mr. MacLaren: The west part of Etobicoke?

Mr. Waddell: The hon. member opposite comes from the west coast, too, but he lives in Etobicoke now. He once lived on the west coast. He should understand that on the coast the people see coastal areas as an extension of the land. It is like land only it is under water. Thus, the provincial government should control it. The reason they want to control it is that they want to have control of the pace of development since that will affect them directly. In simple terms that is why they want control of offshore resources.

I sometimes do not agree with the rather blustery language of the Premier of Newfoundland, or the cold and hard language of the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) when he replies to that Premier. Canadians should look at the problem in the context of simply having the provinces control their offshore, since it is just an extension of the land. They want to control the pace of development. They are right in wanting that. Then if there is a big find of oil or gas, such as Hibernia, the provinces should insist that they have a role to share that with the rest of the country. As I understand it, that is co-operative federalism and the way it would work.

Then someone might ask what the role of the federal government is to be. Are we to leave it out? Is there no government for Canada? That is the argument the Prime Minister has used; but he is avoiding the issue. Of course there is a role for the federal government. It has a role with regard to the environment, fishing, international affairs and the free mobility of labour. In many ways there is concurrent jurisdiction with the federal government. Let us face facts; that is how the situation will be worked out, is it not? Instead, however, we have the federal government jumping the gun and bringing down a pretty strong clause which even takes Sable Island for the government.

We on the west coast are particularly interested in the pace of development, since during the course of the committee

hearings we learned from witnesses such as Chevron that in a few years it will be ready to drill on the west coast. There has been a moratorium on the west coast. I suggest that members look at the excellent brief presented by the West Coast Environmental Law Association to the standing committee. This brief was given on April 2, 1981. I will not repeat what is in the brief, but I will say that the concern that we on the west coast have about our environment and about drilling is present in that brief. We would like to see a public inquiry held before there is any continuation of drilling.

I have said that the government did not listen to the provinces of the east and west coasts, and it did not listen to northerners. I am particularly concerned about the last group. I proposed that the committee travel up north and listen to the people there. They do not think they have received a fair shake in this bill. Why could we not go up north and listen to the people there, considering that they were not consulted, considering that their offshore will be developed and that the pace of development will speed up? They were not properly listened to before the bill was presented. The people of the north were unanimous. They asked that the committee come up and listen. This view was held by the governments of the Yukon and Northwest Territories, the Dene Nation, the Inuit Tapirisat, the Metis Association and the many associations of the north.

I have a letter before me from the Catholic Bishops of the north pleading for fundamental justice. It is a fundamental principle to have a fair hearing. The committee heard from oil company after oil company and bureaucrat after bureaucrat, yet we never really heard from the ordinary people of the north. They want the right to be heard. Why? Because their lives and their land will be affected.

Frankly, I am surprised that a good Québécois like the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources would apply such a colonial attitude to the north. I am surprised that he would take such an inconsistent attitude. His attitude is inconsistent with the Drury report, which was a government report on the north made by a former colleague of the minister who said that the northern territories should have a fair share, a piece of the action with regard to oil and gas revenues. Where is this provided for in the bill? Nowhere. The people of the north should have some say in environmental control since there are great dangers of oil spills on their offshore and in the Beaufort Sea. The minister's attitude is inconsistent with the Berger report. It is inconsistent with the government's own National Energy Program which talks about consulting northerners. His attitude is inconsistent with reality and logic. If there is to be proper development in the north and native people and northerners are to be included in that development, then they must have a better say in the matter than they have now.

I have said to the minister that the ideal thing to do would be to do what the Americans did when they developed the Alaska pipeline. Land claims were settled before they began construction of the line. They made sure the native people had a part to play in the future of Alaska. The American government was prepared to do that. We were not prepared to do