

colleagues. How on earth can we hope to survive as a nation if the government cannot get its act together? What can Canadians expect when ministers of the Crown do not receive the support of their caucus colleagues?

Contradictions of this nature can only call for the resignation of the minister in question, certainly if not from both portfolios, then from the portfolio in which he does not have the support of his caucus colleagues. I put this to the parliamentary secretary and stated that I hoped that the Prime Minister would adopt the suggestion which had been earlier stated by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. Gilchrist), that of splitting this particular ministry. The hon. member and I wanted this in order to ensure that jobs are created in this country and in order that the Prime Minister might make certain that both these departments, under new ministers and new direction, are funded properly. The parliamentary secretary's response to that was:

Madam Speaker, we will.

● (2205)

That is the candidness I spoke of when I first raised the issue. The parliamentary secretary has stated that the government intends to create two new ministries as distinct from the current situation, so that one minister would be looking after science and technology and another would be looking after the Department of the Environment.

Canadians, and certainly members on this side of the House, would like to know who these new ministers will be, what the new funding programs are to be and what new programs the government intends to put in place to create these new jobs for Canadians so that Canada will have the opportunity to continue its growth and we can look forward to a brighter and more prosperous future than we have had in the past.

**Mr. Doug Frith (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member opposite is aware that my departmental responsibilities lies in the area of health and welfare and I am sure he is having some difficulty understanding the concern the health and welfare department has in his question this evening.

Part of the question the hon. member has raised deals in an indirect way with health and welfare when he talks about the problems Canada has experienced in terms of pollutants which will be added to our atmosphere from the conversion program announced in the budget document of October 29, 1980. The hon. member says he feels the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts) should resign because he does not have the support of members on this side of the House. We are in full agreement with what the Minister of the Environment has attempted to do over the past 12 months. The Minister of the Environment has been in the forefront of the battle with the United States, vis-à-vis the effects of acid rain on our environment. He has visited Washington, D.C. and we are now in the process of negotiation with the U.S. government. We are hopeful that in future negotiations over the next three months with the new administration in the United States we will be able to come up with a global program for North America

### *Adjournment Debate*

which will deal with the acid rain problem. It is no surprise to me that the actions of the minister, who has been in the forefront of this battle on acid rain, come directly into question with respect to the measures placed in the October 28 announcement in the budget.

I want to reiterate in response to earlier questions which the hon. member has raised that the government is committed to ensuring that any coal conversions which we encourage and foster will require the observance of strict environmental control. In that respect we have a total commitment on behalf of this government. The conversion program, which is so instrumental to reducing eastern Canada's dependency on oil will, first, decrease our dependence on imported oil and, second, result in immeasurable economic benefits for Atlantic Canada. That is why the government in the energy package of October 28 attached prime importance to the extension of the natural gas pipeline from Quebec City through to the maritimes, which will take that region off oil dependency. Second, the budget document itself contains a major program to use the coal which is available in Atlantic Canada to produce electricity. This will create jobs in Atlantic Canada for the industry, as well, in terms of the technology and the construction of the pipeline and the conversion of the existing plants to coal-fired plants, it will create jobs for others who live in that region. This will not be done at the expense of the environment.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the parliamentary secretary but I must inform him that his time has expired.

#### ENERGY—INQUIRY RESPECTING CONTINGENCY PLANS TO ASSIST UNEMPLOYED OIL WELL DRILLERS

**Mr. Bill Wright (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday I asked a question of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) about the large number of jobs related to the drilling industry which will be lost in Alberta.

● (2210)

The drilling industry said approximately 180 rigs were fast coming to a halt in terms of drilling and this would affect the jobs of 10,800 people. His simple reply was that he did not have an oil agreement with Alberta yet and, therefore, he could not do anything.

Last Monday I asked a similar question of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy). I reminded him that he had been present at a meeting last Friday where the drilling association told him the figures were even worse than I had quoted—that 200 rigs were coming to a halt, most were leaving the country and the job loss would total up to 12,000 in Alberta. What I did not say to the minister, though he had been told, was that the figure could be three times as bad in Ontario. All he could tell me was that job registrations in Alberta were down from last year. Of course they were.

Alberta is a prosperous province. These people have not yet registered. This has only happened since the budget. The rigs