

This is only a sampling of the range of discretionary powers given to the Alberta minister who has power over an area much smaller and much more developed than the Canada lands. If such discretionary power is needed in such circumstances, are we to believe that no discretionary rights are required in the more challenging area of the Canada lands, where the climate is harsh and environmental concerns are more sweeping?

● (2030)

I should also remind the House that in some 13 places in the act there is the right of appeal against ministerial discretion if it is considered that it has been implemented in an arbitrary fashion. In all such instances, the minister's discretion is subject to review.

I want to turn for a moment to Motion No. 7 as an example why we on this side of the House oppose the motions brought forward by the opposition.

Motion No. 7 would amend Subclause 10(1) to add the words "subject to Section 56"; that is, subject to appeal. The effect of such an amendment would be to make the entry into an exploration agreement subject to the appeal process, which is to provide for a review of certain important orders made by the minister under the act. This would provide an opportunity for those affected by an order to object to it and to make representations.

In our view, it would be inappropriate to make Subclause 10 subject to Section 56. Subclause 10(1) merely provides that the minister may enter into an exploration agreement in the manner provided. In most circumstances, the minister would call for proposals and from those submitted he would select one for the negotiation of an exploration agreement. Upon the successful conclusion of such negotiations, the minister would enter into the exploration agreement.

It is difficult, for me at least, to see who would have an interest in applying to the minister for a hearing at that juncture. Certainly it would not be the party negotiating the exploration agreement with the minister. We believe that provision has already been made to deal with the intent behind the motion, and therefore, in our view the motion becomes unnecessary.

I should like to give one more example of a motion which, in our view, is unnecessary; Motion No. 9. Again, it is not clear who would launch an appeal under Section 56 as would be foreseen in this motion. It provides that every exploration agreement would be subject to the terms set out in the proposed Schedule A, which deals with manpower and procurement. The proposed provisions are drawn from the Northern Pipeline Act. While such provisions may be suitable in respect of a bilaterally negotiated agreement with the United States, it is doubtful that such explicit provisions would be appropriate in the quite different circumstances of the Canada Oil and Gas Act.

There are a number of other specific motions before us which I could deal with, but I believe that my time is just about up, Mr. Speaker. I will conclude by saying that the basic

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

purpose of the clauses concerning Canadian procurement and ministerial discretion, is to help promote the Canadianization of our petroleum industry, a policy which carries the broad support of the Canadian people.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), acting House leader for the New Democratic Party.

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hope I turn out to be a good actor. It is a difficult job, as you can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, to fill in, even temporarily, for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Had he been here this evening, I think he would have wanted to add a few words to the debate that has taken place over the last few days, but since he was unable to be here, I might just take two or three moments to put some thoughts on the record with which I am sure he would concur.

I have listened to the debate off and on with considerable interest and sometimes I have wondered what we are talking about. You would swear that we were talking about a resource belonging to someone else from which we hoped to gain some advantage. And sometimes during the debate it would be difficult to realize that what we are talking about is a resource that belongs to every Canadian.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deans:** Not only are we talking about energy self-sufficiency for the future, but surely we are talking about maximizing the benefits to Canadians today and in the future of the exploitation of that resource.

In considering the fairly intricate legislation which is before us, the test that must be applied is the test of history. You have to begin with an understanding that, generally speaking, we have not been able to fully utilize the benefits that we ought to have received from resources that were Canadian in the first place. You need only look at the way we have wasted opportunity after opportunity in every single resource field to understand the perils that could lie ahead unless we are extremely careful about how we draft this legislation and what guarantee we put into it.

I am sure many members have travelled across northern Canada. I do not refer to the far north but to the area that might be called mid-northern Canada, that area that has been exploited over the last half century or more—Timmins, Chapleau, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, northern Ontario, and the rest of the country. One only has to travel that country to see the way the resource was exploited for the benefit of the few to the detriment of the many. One only has to look at the devastation that was left, and then try to measure the cost against the benefit that we in Canada received.

An example is the mining industry. Did we receive any substantial mining machinery manufacturing as a result of having that magnificent mineral resource base in this country? Can we see in Canada a mining machinery manufacturing