

(4) there are 240 days left in the year, and a rig could work 80 per cent of the time, or 190 days.

(5) using 9,000 days and 190 rig days/rig = 50 rigs running full time.

That is a major loss.

Given the continuing need to protect jobs in the industry, especially among the small contractors and service companies, one must ask just what this Government plans to do to replace CEDIP. Its premature cancellation has every appearance of short-term political expediency on the part of this Government. We in the New Democratic Party hope that a suitable replacement will soon be put in its place.

There is an old saying that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. The saying that this Government perhaps should listen to is if it is working, don't break it. That appears to be what is happening here.

I mentioned earlier that this was a Government that, almost as an article of faith, says that it is a business-like Government and a Government that consults with industry, business and those on the ground floor of our economy. It is a Government that administers on a long-term basis, not simply for the short-term and with grab-bag expediencies.

This action by the Government in the cancellation of this program, in spite of all of their words just a few short months ago, puts the lie to those assumptions. This is not a business-like Government. This is obviously not a Government that consults with major companies, workers or with communities who are engaged in large areas of the private sector, at least not in Western Canada. They have forgotten their roots on the other side of the House. They have forgotten their roots with not only level-headed people in the business community, but they have forgotten their roots in that section of the country that gave them some of their strongest political support over the last one or two decades.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Kristiansen: They had better think again, because just as the oil and gas exploration industry in Alberta and other major sections of the oil patch in Canada have been learning that this is a Government of short-term expediency as a result of what they have done with this legislation, so too have the people of my constituency

Exploration and Development

and other historic mining exploration and development areas across the country learned that. Because of the shenanigans, over flow-through shares and the up-again, down-again changes to those programs, people have found out that they cannot rely on the word of this Government when they say they are going to do something for the long term and will introduce a program that lets industry and investors know what the ground rules are for a significant period of time so that they can make the necessary adjustments to gain the maximum amount of revenue and support to those communities and to those industries.

One cannot operate a country this way. For those on the other side who say things are a lot better in the mining and oil industry than they were in the bad old days—and we know which bad old days they are referring to when they use those phrases—I would like them to realize that in good measure because of the changes to the flow-through shares mechanism regarding exploration and drilling in the mining industry that in my own constituency of Kootenay West—Revelstoke, which historically is one of the major areas in Western Canada when it comes to mining exploration and development, unemployment levels have gone up from some 10 per cent, 11 per cent or 12 per cent back up to 16 per cent and 17 per cent. In some cases, it is as high as 19 per cent. We are again approaching exactly those same depths of unemployment as we had during the worst years of the resource debt in the early 1980s.

This is the Government that pledged to begin to change that in the resource areas of this country and particularly in the resource areas of Western Canada. They ignore those commitments at their peril. I ask them to reconsider both this legislation and their whole attitude.

One of those changes that they might also consider, and it is relevant to this particular area of discussion, is their decision to place both the mineral development agreements and the forest resource development agreements under the Western Diversification Fund.

Again, that is a short-term fund for particular companies and particular industries. It does not lead to the kind of long-term planning that is necessary both in the forest industry and the mining industry if we are to see stable and planned growth take place whether publicly or privately within those important sectors.