

*Government Orders*

include refineries or possible petrochemical industries in the Province of Newfoundland.

The NDP now has a motion before the House trying to delay passage of this legislation, wanting to know where the oil is going to go after we had dealt with it for three years in this chamber under a Bill called the Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act.

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think if you will check the Orders of the Day, you will find that the NDP has no motion on any Order Paper pertaining to anything having to do with this bill at the moment, thank you very much.

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, the amendment I am referring to is on the Order Paper. It is Motion No. 3. It was put there on Wednesday, September 26. It is moved by a Mr. Riis and it talks about the quantities and percentage of oil production which are exported or unrefined or in semi-refined states.

The legislation that was passed by this Chamber back in 1987 was bad legislation. It was terrible legislation. It is legislation that should be brought back in and changed, but it is legislation that some of these objectors voted for. That is the incredible part.

The legislation was proclaimed on April 4, 1987 and our refining capacity in Newfoundland went through the pipes four months later, so there was the error. Beyond that, there is an even greater error that says for all time, all petroleum resources offshore in Canada will go to wherever the companies want it to go unless there is a shortage of supply that can be proven by the Newfoundland Government and agreed to by the federal government. Then it would go to arbitration if the companies still object. But if the bids were what they call "commercially acceptable", then the companies would have to deliver oil to "the existing feedstock requirements to industrial capacities that were operating on the time that this act came into force". That restricts it to refineries in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island. That is the law of Canada today.

The hon. minister is adding two words, "and Quebec." There is no reference to the province of Quebec in that legislation that was passed three years ago and neither should there be. Should there have been any reference to Quebec? No. Should there have been reference to any

other province if Newfoundland was not guaranteed some oil? No. Shame on any member from the Bloc Quebecois who would suggest that. That is an outrageous suggestion and an insult to every single Newfoundlander.

I would also suggest in closing, as you are motioning to me that I should be finished, that for the last two weeks, we have had tents in the hon. member's riding of Bonavista—Trinity—Conception. We have had many dozens of tents out in the wilderness where this road is going to be built after the announcement of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. People are living in tents waiting for the start of the construction which the Bloc Quebecois wants to stop so that they claim more people in the province of Quebec can get hired.

Both these motions of the NDP and the Bloc Quebecois should be thrown out because they are not worth the paper they are written on.

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this debate for a few minutes.

Coming from the province of Alberta, we of course, have a strong identification with things relating to oil, the industry, and the importance of it. We recognize just how important the development of a project such as Hibernia can be to a people.

I come from an area where we have a fair amount of oil and gas activity and, in fact, in my riding we have one of the projects that we are all hopeful, with the changes in oil prices right now, may well see some change in activity. Of course, I am referring to the Shell project in the town of Peace River. That particular project deals with putting steam into the ground and removing the oil through a process that is costly and complicated.

• (1810)

As a result of that, we know just how difficult it is to proceed with the development of some of these larger oil projects that are very costly. They produce oil that is very expensive, particularly over the last few years when most of us have seen oil prices dropping dramatically and, as a result, it was just not economically viable to proceed with the more expensive oil.