

The other day the Minister said in the House that we should look at all the jobs that are being created. The fact is that since this Minister of Energy has taken office, jobs have been lost. We have lost 3,000 jobs in the energy department of the National Research Council. Most of those jobs went to private enterprise and private industry. The money was funnelled through the National Research Council and went to ideas like new glass manufacturing that would be equivalent to triple glazing and third generation solar technology. The Government did not know what it was doing when it cut back on that. The Government is so into the propaganda of the Canadian Petroleum Association that it does not look to see where jobs are created.

I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) is a reasonable Member and will understand this. If he wanted to create a job at a McDonald's restaurant in Mission-Port Moody, the capital cost would be about \$15,000. If he wanted to create a job in light manufacturing, it would cost as much as \$150,000 or \$200,000. If he wanted to create a job in heavy manufacturing, it might cost as much as \$500,000. That is the capital cost involved in creating a job. But if he wanted to create jobs in the Beaufort Sea or Hibernia, he might be talking about \$1 million or \$2 million.

● (1240)

I am sure the Hon. Member would agree that we must look at the cost of creating jobs. I say to the Government, when it is lobbied by the Canadian Petroleum Association and when it is pressured to develop resources offshore, in the North and so on, that it should remember the cost of creating the jobs. I do not have the figures that the National Research Council energy department has, but I would bet that it would cost a heck of a lot less than a million dollars to create jobs.

Some of those jobs were created in Vancouver. The riding of the Hon. Member opposite, as well as my riding, were two areas which had some of the best industry in soft energy technology. We must not lose that. It is not hippie, or yoghurt. A lot of Conservatives probably associate soft energy with the sixties, but it is the latest technology. Canada is a world leader in that technology. However, we are cutting it back at the expense of putting a heck of a lot more money into the oil industry.

The oil industry is important. The Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) entertained me in his riding. He is wonderful at showing people around the tar sands. It is important for that industry to continue. But we should not succumb to the siren song that we must give more and more to big oil companies, because they will want more and more. They will want to get rid of the PGRT, to which the Minister alluded in her speech, and then they will want super-depletion allowances and capital cost allowances; they will want to defer their taxes and so on. We will be back to the old ball game in which big oil companies do what they like.

By and large, it is an industry which is foreign-controlled. The National Energy Program tried to push for Canadian

Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax Act

ownership of the energy industry, but it appears that the Government is going to back away from that, unless it comes up with some very innovative taxation scheme for Canadianizing the industry. Our Party would be open to that.

I am prepared to have this Bill pass today. I accept the Minister's argument that companies have filed returns and they have to know where they stand. It is only fair. Because they are operating in this regime, it would be wrong for us to delay the legislation.

I have flagged several issues. One issue is that there are not the millions and millions of jobs which big oil companies suggest. In fact, there are more jobs in soft energy than there are in non-renewable resources.

Second, there will have to be a change in the PGRT, according to government policy. We will be watching that very closely to see that it is not simply a return to the old regime, which was basically a giveaway to oil companies.

Third, if the Government follows its present pattern, it will give more away to oil companies. As I have indicated, on the basis of the Consumer Price Index figures of today, the one item which really increased was energy. In the first three months of Conservative government energy went up. That is typical. Perhaps some government Members do not understand that the Conservatives want to redistribute money from the average ordinary Canadian, both at the pump and in the home. That money will go into the pockets of big oil companies, which are largely foreign-controlled.

If that is the kind of change for which Canadians voted, I am very surprised. I do not think Canadians want that kind of system, especially when they realize what the Conservatives are doing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In view of the Member's very kind remarks toward the Chair in his preamble, I must inform him that he has approximately 20 minutes remaining. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that the first three speakers had a 40-minute maximum. We will now revert to 20-minute speeches with questions and answers.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for suggesting that I had more time. However, I will not take the time. As a young lawyer I learned that the judge was sometimes on my side, but that if I continued to speak, sometimes the judge went against me. So you quit while you are ahead!

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that there is time remaining, could we get the unanimous consent of the House to ask the Hon. Member a couple of questions?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): No, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey).

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks