

The Budget—Mr. Cullen

At the present time the government has the Adult Occupational Training Act and we do not wish to move into the educational field, but the creation of jobs is everyone's responsibility. Here is an area where the federal government co-operates with the provinces and negotiates three-year agreements so that training programs can take place right across Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, the training opportunities are there. We know that the jobs will be available and I think that what must take place is more meetings between the federal minister and the provincial ministers to see to it that we dovetail this work in order that the young people are trained for the jobs which will obviously be available in the future.

One of the difficulties we have in this party and in this part of the country is getting the message across to Alberta. The Alberta Chamber of Commerce seem to think that Canadians in this part of the country do not appreciate that when Alberta is successful and pipelines are built there are spin-off benefits for Ontario. We do understand that and we do appreciate it. We also appreciate the contribution which Alberta has made with the export tax on oil helping toward the one-price oil system. That is a significant contribution, and nobody denies it. But when the message is spread out west that we do not have that appreciation and that we expect all of the manufacturing and development should take place in Ontario, it is just not in accordance with the facts.

Some years ago, in approximately 1968 or 1969, the petrochemical industry was in some difficulty. The then minister of industry, trade and commerce, the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin), brought together a group of government and business people and, without recrimination, asked what was wrong with the petrochemical industry and what could be done to make it work. There was a whole series of suggestions made by industry and by government. But the main thing that emerged was that we did not have the economies of scale here and we did not have the needed access to American markets. We needed to build world-scale plants. But if every company got involved in building a world-scale plant that would be counter-productive and, down the road, we would have to rationalize. So the determination was made, as early as 1968, 1969 and 1970, to build three world-scale plants. This was not a government decision, it was an economic, business decision that the first one be built in Ontario. The intention at that time was to build the second one in Alberta and the third one in the Montreal area. That prediction has proven to be true.

But the feeling is that Ontario got the Petrosar plant and that this has worked to the detriment of the Alberta petrochemical industry. In fact nothing could be further from the truth because, with a strong petrochemical industry, be it in Ontario, Alberta or Quebec, it will be beneficial to all of Canada. It will help with the balance of payments. Just as one indicator, I believe the Petrosar balance of payments picture represents a difference of about \$1.5 billion and Alberta is now embarked upon the construction of a world-scale plant and other petrochemical operations in that great province. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not that we are unaware.

I see the hon. member from Calgary is here. I must tell him the story that was going around when we were endeavouring to get our message out there to *The Calgary Herald*, the *Edmonton Journal* or to our good friend Ron Collister who, we understand, has an open line show. There was a suggestion made that if an earthquake struck Calgary the headline would be: "Harvie Andre's House Slightly Damaged in Earthquake". It is very difficult for us to get our message across in face of that kind of rhetoric in Alberta.

I want to make the point again, Mr. Speaker; we appreciate that the Albertan people are generous. We appreciate what has been done, not only in Ontario with the tremendous benefit it has derived from the petrochemical industry, but also in Quebec and the Atlantic regions which have the benefit of the export tax which keeps the price of oil down to at least a manageable level.

● (1730)

There is room for all in Canada, Mr. Speaker, and there is money enough for everyone. All we are asking is for a proper sharing. I do not think the production from a barrel of oil divided on a 45-33-24 basis is out of line. It is appropriate, given the involvement and investment that all Canadians have contributed to make the oil industry the success it is today. I think it is appropriate to set the price of \$38 per barrel to help with Syncrude and the heavy oil operations.

There is an opportunity for us to develop, but we have to work things out together in the traditional Canadian way of sharing the benefits, of helping one another, so that when we are down, other provinces and the federal government will come to our aid. They will help us over the hurdle and then go on to help whatever other area of the country needs assistance.

I can support this budget without qualm or concern. It does not cover all subjects and it was not meant to, but many of the areas the opposition would like to see covered are already taken care of.

The energy package is the most dynamic energy policy ever introduced in this country. The companies asked for ground rules and now we have ground rules as suggested by the federal government. On a radio or television program I heard Mr. Daniels asked if he was going to sell out and get out in view of the budget and its detrimental effect on the industry. He said he was not and that he could operate within this regime. It would certainly be nicer to have 45 per cent than 33 per cent but we should not forget that the 33 per cent will be based on a much higher price per barrel of oil.

We can make this country work, Mr. Speaker, if we stop the rhetoric and the use of words like "declaration of war", "rape of resources", "unconscionable", "not thinking", "not caring" or "not appreciating". That is what is going to kill it, Mr. Speaker, not a budget like this or an energy policy like this. They are good for Canada. If there is more negotiating to be done, then let us do it. At least we now have good ground work.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!