

*Canada Petroleum Resources Act*

which will rob us of jobs we thought we would have, but Government programs have been slashed. Many jobs in the Public Service and in other areas of our province upon which we depended for a livelihood for some time have been cut back. There have been lay-offs in the fisheries and in transport. Other policies have been introduced, such as wharfage fees for fishermen. That kind of policy or kind of cost recovery is having a damaging and tragic effect upon the economy of the Atlantic provinces. The Government of Canada has changed its policy on oil, its fiscal regime, and its tax structure ensuring that projects will not go ahead. At the same time it has cut back on Government services upon which we have historically depended over the years.

It is a bleak day for Newfoundland. The people in my province had hoped for good times ahead. Now those dreams are beginning to fade. The Government should wake up and see the reality of what is happening. It should take steps to change its present policy. We require special incentives for Canadian companies. We require a mechanism in place which ensures that Hibernia and other projects can go ahead. Indeed, some of those steps have been taken by the Government of Canada and, for example, by the Government of Alberta. However, more of that needs to be done. Not enough has been done. The process has to be accelerated and expanded.

I say to my colleagues opposite that if that does not happen, if the Government does not step in, if the Government does not take steps to ensure that Hibernia goes ahead and that oil fields produce not only oil but jobs, there will be a time of reckoning for them. It will be, if not before, in the next election. The people of my province are seeing a Government which does not care; a Government which is not concerned about their welfare, their livelihood, and their future; a Government which does not care about their future with the Canadian companies they built. Again I plead with the Government to change its policy and to put in place a mechanism which ensures real jobs in the offshore and in Newfoundland and Labrador for the future.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed, as I always do, listening to my hon. friend. He made some very constructive points, but I am interested in understanding a couple of items.

The Hon. Member talked about the importance of bringing Hibernia onstream for the purpose of security of supply. I do not quite understand how bringing it onstream assures security of supply. If we know the oil is there, and if we know the amount that is there, surely that is security of supply. I was somewhat confused by his comments in that regard and I would like some clarification of them. I can see bringing it onstream for the economic good of his province; that is fair enough.

He also talked about initiatives and incentives to bring Hibernia onstream. Could he give some concrete ideas of what he has in mind? Could he be a little more specific about what he feels the Government should do? I would be very interested in hearing his ideas.

**Mr. Rompkey:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's first question, we do not know exactly what is the field in the offshore. The reason many companies wanted to do more drilling was simply to verify exactly what was there. We have an idea, but we do not know specifically how much is there. It would be very useful to know exactly what is there in the offshore.

We were told about the number of rigs which would have been operating this year. Bob Blair, Chairman of Husky, said that because of the financial support system they could not do the work they were to do. They wanted to get out there; they wanted to verify what was out there. That is one thing the Government should be doing.

● (1620)

Let me go back to a previous policy. I recall that part of the National Energy Program was a made in Canada price. That sort of thing could be explored again. I recall that we had a price for old oil, a price for new oil and a combined price for Canadian projects. Why can the Government of Canada not look at that again? It was a policy before. I suspect the same bureaucrats in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources are the ones who helped to put that policy together in the first place. If it made some sense then, why does it not make some sense now when the world price of oil has dropped? Let us look at a Canadian solution. Sure the oil is there offshore, but multinational companies are bringing oil in from outside the country. It is cheaper for Esso to bring oil in from elsewhere than to use resources in Canada.

I am not the Government, Mr. Speaker. Members on the other side are. Our job is to say what the Government is doing and how it affects Canadians. If the Government is looking for solutions, perhaps Government Members could look again at the solutions proposed earlier on, look at incentives to drill to verify oil fields, and to look at a made in Canada price for the production of those projects.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, it did my heart good to hear the Hon. Member for Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) tell about the hundreds of Newfoundlanders who were finding work in Fort McMurray and in Alberta. I have visited Fort McMurray many times. I have seen young people, young men, older men and women from all parts of Canada who were doing well. But what killed the industry in Alberta was the National Energy Program. The Member says it was good for Canadians. It was good for some Canadians, but it literally destroyed the oil and gas industry in Alberta and part of Saskatchewan. It drove hundreds of our rigs and people with expertise out of the country.

**An Hon. Member:** Rubbish.

**Mr. Rompkey:** You are the Government now.

**Mr. Taylor:** It brought on an artificial depression. That is what the National Energy Program did for Alberta. Had it not