

Adjournment Debate

are gradually coming to a halt. Their contracts are not being renewed. Of course these people have not registered for jobs.

The point is, the minister knew this but did not state it in his answer. He had been given a briefing by the drilling industry where they laid it on the line to him, telling him how desperate it was going to be in Alberta. However, both the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of Employment and Immigration are ignoring what is happening in western Canada as well as in eastern Canada.

Opposition members on this side are united in their condemnation of the government's National Energy Policy. We consider it a deliberate raid on western interests, and the government should reopen negotiations with Alberta and the other producing provinces. There is no question but that this policy is detrimental to the Canadian economy. The proposed oil and gas pricing schedule was unilaterally arrived at and will lead to further confrontation and division with the producing provinces.

Why are all the members on this side opposed to the national energy policy? Why do the members on this side not believe what they are told? There is a document which spells it out very clearly. It is at page 8478 of *Hansard* for December 6, 1973. I quote from that:

My immediate task is to place before the House proposals which will set the basis for a new national oil policy. The objective of that policy, to be reached before the end of this decade, is Canadian self-sufficiency in oil and oil products.

That statement was made by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). That is why we do not believe him and that is why the only solution for Canada as a whole is the resignation of that man.

It is not only this party which is against the national oil policy. What are the provinces saying? British Columbia will lose approximately \$1.2 billion between now and 1983 and they estimate some problems in selling this higher priced gas to the United States. The B.C. finance minister has called the National Energy Policy proposals a blatant money grab and power grab by Ottawa. The Alberta treasurer called the national energy policy a massive discrimination against the province of Alberta and an attempted takeover of the ownership of the depleting resources owned by the people of Alberta.

● (2215)

Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan indicated that he was unhappy with the 8 per cent production tax on oil and gas and also the gas export tax. Ontario treasurer Frank Miller stated that taxing the Canadian people to buy the existing oil industry is a misallocation of resources and a complete waste of time. Premier Lévesque of Quebec condemned the unilateral nature of the federal government move in respect of oil and gas policy. In the maritimes the Premier of P.E.I. stated that the national energy policy will not benefit the people of P.E.I. Lastly, Premier Peckford of Newfoundland called the National Energy Program stupid.

The chairman of Dome Petroleum, Jack Gallagher, referred to the federal energy policies as shortsighted, ignorant and contrary to the nation's energy needs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dennis Dawson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the hon. member touched upon several points in his speech on the energy program of the government. In the three minutes allowed me, I could without a doubt defend that energy policy and refute his stand because it is to be expected that the provinces which wanted to derive maximum benefits from the energy resources of the Canadian government should resent the fact that the federal government is assuming its responsibilities in attempting, as it is doing, to share this wealth around.

But I shall limit myself, Mr. Speaker, to that aspect dealing with job creation and unemployment both of which are directly and indirectly related to the energy program of the government.

[*English*]

While industry estimates of the total downturn in oil well drilling activity for 1980-81 now run as high as 40 per cent, the impact this will have on employment in western Canada is not yet clear. For example, of the 587 rigs in Canada as of December 9, 1980, 458 were drilling. This compares to the 436 that were drilling in December, 1979, out of a total of 510 rigs in Canada at that time.

At the present time our Canada employment centres in Alberta, where most of the rigs are located, report some employment enquiries from oil rig workers, but no apparent trend is apparent at this stage. This situation is being monitored on a monthly basis and it is expected that any unemployment impact will be more accurately reflected in our records in the coming months. This will be followed closely by the department.

Given the high demand for labour in Alberta, it is anticipated that alternative employment will be available to any oil rig workers who are laid off. There will not, of course, be a perfect match of skills and benefits. We shall be trying to do our best in that regard. However, the regular programs and services of the commission which will be immediately available to these workers are considered fully adequate to meet the demands anticipated.

In so far as the downstream effects on suppliers in central Canada are concerned, and the effects in eastern Canada, I expect they will be fully compensated by the megaproject we are developing with the government in the west. That may well be the prebuilt pipeline in Alberta and I am sure it will certainly compensate for those ill effects.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES—SHIPMENT OF VITAVAX PESTICIDE TO NEPAL AND INDIA

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to deal with the answer to a question I received on