

massive intervention with Alberta to say that rather than getting 45 per cent they will get 43 per cent? Is it fair for oil companies that were making 45 per cent of \$3, \$4 and \$5 per barrel for oil, thus enabling them to operate, work in the north, build islands in lakes and rivers and do exploratory work, to tell me now that they cannot get enough cash to explore, develop and produce at 43 per cent of the price which will be paid for oil? This, to me, stretches credibility a little too far.

There was a suggestion that federal government policies led to the fact that the Atlantic provinces had to rely on offshore. It is rather interesting to have the genius of hindsight. I know when I first came here, Mr. Speaker, and we were talking about exporting to the United States something like 350,000 to 400,000 barrels of oil a day and the pressure was on every day to do everything we could to increase that from 350,000, we looked upon it as a victory if we were able to do that. Had we possessed the value of foresight we would not have taken that action.

● (1720)

I heard the former minister of finance yesterday castigating this government for its Canadianizing procedures, and knocking Petro-Canada. I must say that when I first came here I was not all that sold on the idea of Petro-Canada or a Canadian national oil corporation. But when I found out that we had been misled by the oil companies back in 1971 and 1972, when they told us we had all the oil we would require for the next hundred years, and then almost overnight there was a shortage, it was then I knew, and became convinced, that we needed a national oil company—and so did the majority of Canadians.

Thank heaven for the former minister of energy, mines and resources, the Hon. Alastair Gillespie. I think he left us a tremendous legacy. Petro-Canada is going to evolve into Canada's national oil company and it is to his credit that he stood fast and saw to it that this operation was very much involved and had the kind of funding it needed so that it could be successful. What did we hear from the Conservatives? The government was going to dismantle Petro-Canada despite the obvious need for this particular Crown corporation. I understand that as recently as two years ago they were still talking about that, that Petro-Canada should be dismantled. I wonder if they will really ever learn that Canadians want a national oil company.

I listened very carefully to the former minister of finance yesterday. He is always entertaining but he is not always very accurate. He suggested that eventually they might very well erect a couple of statues, the Clark-Crosbie statues. It seemed to me that if they were going to construct statues they would have to put them on a much firmer base than the Conservative party has for the particular platforms they are advocating. I think after a while you would find the two statues leaning on one another and the only ones appreciating the statues would be the pigeons.

I was really concerned with the position taken by the New Democratic Party, who were talking about spending more

money in the interest of creating jobs—a stimulative deficit, is what they called it. That has a nice ring to it. The only problem is that it probably would not work. If it did not work we would have an even bigger deficit than at the present time. The one we have now is too high and barely manageable, but it is manageable. The constant pressure from the NDP to spend more money to increase the deficit is a counter-productive idea, in so far as it relates to average Canadians.

I listened to their criticism when I was the minister of employment and immigration and they told me to stop using band-aid solutions, to stop the Canada Works program and to get into something which would be more permanent. That is exactly what we endeavoured to do with the economic growth component of Canada Works. We worked with the provinces and we created longer-term jobs. Today the emphasis is on more permanent job creation and not on Canada Works projects. I think that at a time of high unemployment there is a place for Canada Works and Young Canada Works programs. It gives people an opportunity to do a bit of work, earn some money and make a contribution to the economy. Obviously the impact is short term, but it does give people a sense of accomplishment, of making a contribution. And most assuredly they were getting experience which was required. To suggest there is no job creation at the present time is just ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. We know the investment which has to be made.

The new energy program which has been introduced by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources screams out with the promise of jobs which will be made for Canadians. The fact is that funding will be made available for apprenticeship training for the young people who are looking for and who need the jobs. They should be the ones to fill them as a result of training received in Canada. These jobs should not be filled as a result of immigration.

Examining the unemployment figures we see that for the adult male over 25 the unemployment rate is 4.8 per cent. The rate for unemployed females over 25 is 6.2 per cent. This is definitely too high, but the Leader of the New Democratic Party himself has used a figure that full employment in Canada means about 3 per cent unemployment. We heard the Hon. Darcy McKeough suggesting that something like 5.5 per cent unemployment was full employment because of the benefits which accrue, whether they are negotiated through union contracts or benefits which accrue as a result of government action. This is an area where we have high unemployment but where there are means available to help people in particularly difficult circumstances.

Where the emphasis must be is where the unemployment is tragically high—among our young people between the ages of 14 and 25. And that is why I welcome the large amount of money which will be spent on energy projects, on counselling and guidance work, hopefully. We will say to the provinces, "Please honour and respect and give more training to your guidance counsellors at your high schools because they will have a bigger and more important role to play in the future."