

*Canada Oil and Gas Act*

I have learned a great deal from this bill and, before hon. members heckle me and say "It's about time" and so forth, let me say I have learned all this during the course of the year, in committee day after day, at all the stages of this bill in the House, in press interviews and statements outside the House and in discussions with my colleagues and with other members of the House. In watching this bill develop I have learned a great deal, and I will tell hon. members what I have learned: "Them that's got power gets." Those who do not have power, no matter how just their cause, lose. This is the problem with the Canadian political system, and it has shown up in this bill. Greed and privilege seem to triumph over justice and equity, and that is sad.

That can be seen now with respect to the Constitution. The provincial premiers have the power, so the native people lose out. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) wanted the support of our party, he was prepared to accept an amendment to the Constitution relating to native peoples. Now that he has a deal with the provinces, he forgets about that.

**Mr. Irwin:** Who sent us to the provinces?

**Mr. Waddell:** That is what happens, and this bill shows it. Whenever the industry has cried out, it has received basically what it has wanted.

There have been eight changes to this bill, but they have not helped environmental groups. They did not win. They have not helped native groups nor northern groups. Those changes have helped the industry. That was the only flexibility this government showed, apart from a few token clauses without prejudice to native claims, which mean nothing, especially since native claims are not even in the Constitution now. These things in the bill mean nothing, but every change in the bill benefits the industry.

I can go through the changes chapter and verse. It is a little late to do that now, but one result of the debate last week is that the royalty holidays have been extended. There were modifications to the 25 per cent Petro-Canada back-in. In the future companies will be paid a little more for the back-in privilege. There were modifications respecting the date of pioneer production so that rich industry could escape more taxation. Every change made generally helped the industry. That is what the Liberals did for the industry, and they did not do much for northerners or native people. It was shocking that our Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works did not even go north to talk to the native people. It is disgusting. I asked for support from my Conservative friends. I tried to filibuster in the committee so that we could go north. What did the Conservatives do? They got together with the Liberals, ended the committee and brought the bill back here. It was shameful and shocking that northern members could agree to that.

The first clause in the bill deals with Canada lands. The native people are the majority on Canada lands. We did not even consult those who are the majority. What kind of democracy is that?

It was instructive to me to see the positions of the parties respecting this bill. The Conservative party fought tooth and nail and brought out every dinosaur in its caucus to fight for the oil companies, to stop the 25 per cent Petro-Canada back-in and to attack Petro-Canada. That was their strategy and their position on the bill.

● (1720)

When we pointed to Suncor in which Bill Davis of Ontario bought a percentage, the Conservatives said that was different.

**Mr. Stewart:** What's different about it?

**Mr. Waddell:** That is my point, what is different about it? My friend might read a column in *The Toronto Sun* by Claire Hoy. I do not know whether he is a supporter of this side of the House, but the article states:

To the NDP, you should not only buy into companies, you should buy control, a position which makes sense if you accept the principle of government intervention.

That is the point we have been making in this debate. This bill, with its Petro-Canada back-ins and giveaways, does not do anything to give control of the energy industry, Canada's most important industry, to the Canadian people. It gives control to the multinational companies and a few large Canadian companies.

I want to deal with some of the Liberal policies reflected in this bill. I want to make three points. First, we should remember it was past Liberal policy that got us into this foreign ownership crisis. Now they are proposing only half measures to get us out of it.

By and large it was not people on this side that got an industry which is more foreign controlled than any other country, industrialized or non-industrialized, would permit. They got us into it and now propose half measures to get us out of it.

My second point is the 50 per cent Canadian ownership which the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources spoke about so glowingly. That does not necessarily mean Canadian control. Foreign domination will remain. My colleagues and I made that point consistently throughout our speeches. However, we have had no real reply from the other side of the House.

Third, the Liberal's Canadianization plan means privatization. What we are talking about is public ownership and control. Let that be clear. That is what the parliamentary secretary talked about when referring to Canadianization. These flaws are all reflected in this bill.

I want to talk a bit about the Liberal record. In 1974 the Prime Minister promised that we would have 50 to 60 per cent Canadian ownership in all new energy projects. He did not keep that promise. Now he is promising 50 per cent Canadian ownership, not control, by 1990.

The parliamentary secretary stated that we had made great progress. He mentioned that we had gone up to about 35 per cent Canadian ownership, a 5 per cent increase as a result of