

## FISHERIES

## EFFECTS OF RUSHED CATCH PLAN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni):** Madam Speaker, whereas the major fish processors and offshore vessel owners on Canada's east coast have issued a direct challenge to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans 1981 fishing plan by catching their total allowable haddock catch in a compressed time-frame, and whereas this practice caused severely depressed prices to inshore fishermen leading to a three week tie up, and is bound to recur in other fisheries, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell):

That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans investigate the implications of this rushed catch plan by the major companies on fish prices to offshore and inshore fishermen, on incomes to plant workers, and on prices to consumers, with a view to developing a more rational and orderly catch scheme for 1982.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

## ENERGY

OIL PRICING AGREEMENT—FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL  
NEGOTIATIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown):** Madam Speaker, the Alsands Energy Ltd. consortium which includes 17 per cent ownership by PetroCan has put together a management team which is ready, willing and able to proceed with their project if an oil pricing agreement is reached. Their team will be lost if such an agreement is not reached or significant progress is not made. Since 50 per cent of the major equipment and bulks will come from Ontario and Quebec, and 50 per cent of the supply-erect subcontracts will come from Ontario and Quebec, with a value of some \$1.6 billion and the creation of thousands of jobs, it is imperative that both sides come to an agreement quickly. Therefore, under Standing Order 43 I move, seconded by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis):

That the Government of Canada quit creating jobs in Saudi Arabia, Venezuela and Mexico and start creating jobs in Canada by coming quickly to a fair and realistic agreement on energy pricing.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## Oral Questions

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO DEBATE BILL C-57—MOTION UNDER  
S.O. 43

**Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin):** Madam Speaker, by invoking closure last night on Bill C-57, the Liberal government has effectively choked adequate debate in the House by members particularly from western Canada who wanted to convince the government to accept amendments, and may also inhibit the June 10 negotiations in Alberta. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga)

That the government reconsider and allow for debate on amendments of these regressive oil and gas taxes.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

● (1415)

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## ENERGY

OIL PRICING AGREEMENT—INSTRUCTIONS TO FEDERAL  
NEGOTIATORS

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Oil prices have increased 12 times since the beginning of 1980, for a total of \$12.79 per barrel; 72 per cent of this \$12.79 has ended up in the federal government coffers in the form of increased taxes. The Alberta proposal of July, 1980, would have resulted in a price increase of only about half this amount, or about \$6.50 per barrel. So all Canadians have today are high energy taxes and low energy development.

What instructions has the government given to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to break the deadlock with Alberta, a deadlock which has been caused directly by Liberal government greed and the broken election promises of the 1980 election?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, in so far as the latter part of the question is concerned, I repeat the figures given to the House by the Minister of Finance, to the effect that because the Clark-Crosbie budget was not applied, consumers in Canada have now saved \$1.9 billion over what they would have saved.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!