

Employment Tax Credit Act

inces. Sometimes you have to move ahead and try the project rather than sit and wait until every "t" is crossed and every "i" dotted by provincial governments, because their objectives in creating employment are not always identical to those of the federal Department of Employment and Immigration.

I hope the minister will be able to give us some indication of how soon and what form these LEDA corporations will take, because I know they are eagerly sought after by groups like the Manitoulin Economic Development Association and the North Shore Economic Development Association, both of which have already been established but do not have the kind of funding this concept would provide.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Algoma I would like to indicate that the amount of capital that will be available to each project will be quite a limited amount. We would like to use the greatest proportion of the money for employment, the actual labour aspect of the project itself.

What I can indicate to him is that we have had discussions with a number of federal departments—the hon. member referred to Fisheries and Oceans—and we will work out combinations. If federal departments want to undertake some capital works projects, the individual department will put up the capital and we will put up the employment money. This is why we are trying to decentralize it in each region so if there is a wharf project, or a special capital works project that Fisheries and Oceans or Public Works might wish to carry out, we will be able to combine our efforts and give it priority.

I think it is incumbent upon members of Parliament, who see the kinds of priorities in their areas, to develop that kind of a project and approach the minister who has the capital side of it, and we will then supply the labour side. I think that is the way we will work those projects.

I should also indicate to the hon. member that, contrary to the last phase of Canada Works, we will be applying development money in each constituency. There will be a base allocation and we will then add to that, based upon unemployment figures, an additional amount; the higher the unemployment figures and the labour surplus the more money will be put into the constituency. In addition, we will put special criteria in for native unemployment. As a result, in an area like the hon. member's there will be a special allocation based upon native unemployment.

As for the LEDA program, I should say it is a program about which I am personally excited. I think it may provide one of the answers to long-term unemployment problems in Canada, helping small communities and others to develop an economic base of growth.

I see that you are going to call it ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman. We will continue this dialogue another day.

The Chairman: It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to consider the bill again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ENERGY CONSERVATION—INQUIRY WHETHER LEGISLATIVE ACTION PROPOSED

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, on May 26 and May 27 I asked some questions of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) regarding certain documents which I had in my possession, one a confidential document from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources policy and analysis sector, and the other a transcript of an interview with the assistant deputy minister of energy, Mr. Clark. These statements were of concern to me because of the obvious problems which were noted in those documents with regard to the department wanting to get the nation off oil and on to other non-renewable energy sources.

At the same time they were considering that policy they were saying that they could not have two policies, one dealing with getting the nation off oil and one dealing with conservation of energy. The minister said that he was not aware of those statements within his department, and that is why I wanted to carry this debate on more fully this evening. I want to quote some of the statements which were made within these documents. One is from a source within the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources which states that:

—policy rationale within EMR is getting narrower and narrower. The decision-making balance is off keel. Though conservation will still make advances, the heavy emphasis on off-oil has gone beyond what reasonable economic analysis would allow.

Mr. Clark, the assistant deputy minister, stated in response to that:

—you don't want to give the public too many confusing signals so you really have to decide whether you are telling them to get off oil or are you telling them to conserve energy.

That does not show much faith in the intelligence of the Canadian people. He goes on to say:

Since in the short run what we really want them to do is to get off oil, we ought to concentrate our communications efforts on getting them off oil rather than conserving energy.

This is of deep concern to me because there is such a quick and cheap supply of energy available to Canada through the conservation policy. When the assistant deputy minister makes statements like this, it makes me wonder about the policies of the department.

Mr. Clark goes on to say:

—it would be nice to conserve all sorts of energy but it does seem to me—at least my advertising people tell me—

Is the department now considering its policy through its advertising department? Mr. Clark goes on: