

for tomorrow, has changed the ground rules dramatically. It has walked away from offshore Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. This plant, in an area where there is 30 per cent unemployment, and which was able to acquire the financing from the banks in the first place, now passes every single day in dread of the news that the development which was promised will now be shelved. Because of the fiscal policies of the Government there is a sense in offshore Newfoundland that there has been a death in the family and that no one has bothered to announce the date of the funeral. That is the sense which pervades in the Province of Newfoundland. It is in that type of environment that 6,000 civil servants are in the streets in the Province of Newfoundland as we speak today.

The Government of Canada is not responsible for world oil prices. I do not blame it for something which is beyond its control. It is not responsible for the turn-around in the economy. That is also as a result of world economic factors and not as a result of the good policies of the Government. While it is not responsible for decreased prices, it is also not responsible for positive factors which have been generated by the world economy.

Let me tell Hon. Members for what this Government is responsible. It is responsible for changing the rules of the game. It is responsible for withdrawing funds which were committed and promised as recently as in the May Budget. It is responsible for breaking commitments which were given and upon which substantial investment in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia was made. That is what this Government is responsible for.

The Government continues with a market-place doctrinaire-driven mentality which would see the Government stand idly by while the oil industry of Alberta is destroyed. It is responsible for the market-place free enterprise philosophy to the extent that it will stand by to see the play off Newfoundland and Nova Scotia destroyed. It is worse than that. It is worse when one comes from a province in which we saw 84 men go down on the rig *Ocean Ranger*, 84 men who drowned at sea in an accident which was preventable. It is worse coming from a province in which we saw a federal-provincial royal commission on the disaster recommend certain changes and improvements at a cost of \$20 million of taxpayers' money. It is worse coming from a province in which we have seen excellent recommendations designed to provide every possibility of rescue in the event of a disaster at sea. The Government has not moved on the major recommendations of the royal commission which looked into the *Ocean Ranger* disaster.

There was a Bill tabled in the House today, Bill C-75, a transportation Bill which contains within it the seeds of insanity. Despite the recommendations of the royal commission and the results of two Federal Court of Appeal cases, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Miss Carney) has refused to pass the jurisdiction with respect to rigs operating in the offshore over to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski). Why has she done this when the Minister of Transport has jurisdiction for every other vessel or type of equipment which floats in the nation's seas under the jurisdiction of the

### *Petroleum Incentives Program Act*

Canada Shipping Act? Why should he not also have jurisdiction over such an area? Why should the Minister of Energy maintain jurisdiction over such rigs? What sense does it make? There is a political personality fight brewing in Cabinet. The other day I had to sit through a spectacle in the legislative committee on Bill C-75 where I saw a phrase added to the Bill which states that with respect to questions of safety—those questions regarding the life and limb of people who work in the offshore—there will be unprecedented joint jurisdiction between a power-mad Minister of Energy and an empire-building—

**Mrs. Sparrow:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I really wonder whether or not the address being given by my hon. friend is relevant to Bill C-85 which deals with the phasing out of PIP grants.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I think the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow) is right. I believe the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) will return to making his comments relevant to the Bill before us.

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal more particularly with Bill C-85. I am sure the Hon. Member from Alberta will appreciate my emotional response in which I have taken the opportunity to express my disgust at what is obviously a ridiculous situation resulting from petty personality politics.

Let me say to my colleague from Alberta, who has reminded me to speak more particularly to Bill C-85, that it must be frustrating for her—indeed, for all Hon. Members from Alberta—to see thousands of jobs, particularly in the last four or five weeks, disappear in the Province of Alberta quicker than the snow disappears in the spring, while the Minister of Energy says nothing more than—

● (1520)

**Mrs. Sparrow:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My hon. colleague's remarks are still not relevant to the Bill which phases out PIP grants.

**Mr. Tobin:** They are very relevant.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I am sure the Hon. Member still has a few moments to speak and I know he is going to get back to Bill C-85. I think he is trying to get to Bill C-85.

**Mr. Tobin:** That is correct, Mr. Speaker. It is relevant to Bill C-85 because it is part of the total fiscal regime for the energy plague. Whether PIP grants exist or not, what happens to the oil industry in the frontiers is very relevant to what happens in Alberta.

Perhaps the Hon. Member does not understand that it is part of the total fiscal regime, but I admire the Hon. Member. She is genuinely serious and sincere. I have heard her express her great concern for the lack of action on job loss in Alberta. If she does not understand what I am saying, then I ask her to take my word for it that it is relevant. It is indeed relevant