

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Keep your face straight.

**Mr. Lalonde:** I remind my hon. friend that the price of a litre of oil in Calgary today is cheaper than it is in the United States because there are no provincial taxes there. The provincial taxes vary from 20 per cent to 40 per cent in some provinces. Those taxes are much higher than they are in the United States. That is the explanation for the difference. The best evidence of this is that a litre of heating oil today is as much as seven cents to nine cents cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States.

## JOB CREATION STRATEGY

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. He will be aware that both the throne speech and the budget papers state that the government's general economic strategy is to provide jobs from spin-offs of the major energy projects. In the November, 1981, budget paper under the heading "The Development Opportunities" we find this sentence:

The leading opportunity lies in the development of Canada's rich bounty of natural resources.

In the next paragraph we find this sentence:

Major projects task force, for example, identifies \$440 billion of potential projects, predominantly in the energy and resource sectors.

The minister has seen the collapse of Alsands, and the Cold Lake project is on hold. The Alaska pipeline is on hold at best, and is perhaps dead. I do not hold any brief for the oil companies, but I am concerned about jobs for ordinary Canadians. What is left of the government's economic strategy in the way of jobs from these energy megaprojects now that we are seeing them fall one by one?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my hon. friend the number of projects in the energy field that are still in progress and under active construction. I could refer him to Dome Petroleum's Beaufort Sea oil and gas exploration project for \$500 million, the Norman Wells oil fields development for \$600 million; the Revelstoke hydro project in B.C. for over \$1 billion—

**Mr. Siddon:** You are grasping at straws. That has nothing to do with you.

**Mr. Lalonde:** —the Trans Quebec and Maritime Pipeline for over \$1 billion, the Quintette coal development project for \$700 million, the Ridley Island and the grain terminals in B.C. with an investment of over \$400 million. I could go on and mention to the hon. member other projects in the energy field that are under active consideration at the present time by provincial and federal governments and by private industry.

**Mr. McDermid:** Why are there so many unemployed?

**Mr. Lalonde:** There is still a lot of activity taking place in spite of the fact, regrettably, that the Alsands project is not proceeding.

## PIPELINES

## FINANCING OF ALASKA GAS PIPELINE

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Madam Speaker, before hon. members opposite applaud, those figures amount to \$4.2 billion. Alsands is worth \$13.5 billion, and the Alaska pipeline is worth \$40 billion. The minister is on the hot seat and he has some explaining to do. I want to give him some explanation about the Alaska Highway pipeline project.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Which you voted against.

**Mr. Waddell:** As the minister knows, we opposed the prebuild of the line because, without the financial guarantees, there was no way the whole project could be completed. Now we are left with one quarter of the job completed. We are left with no Dempster lateral and we are left with an export pipeline to the United States. Does the minister still have the naiveté or the gall to stand up in this House and to say that this project can still be financed in the immediate future?

• (1430)

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, with regard to the first project to which the hon. member referred, again I would have to tell him that his party should make up its mind. Last week that party objected to the offer which we made to the private companies and found it excessive and too generous; today it is deploring the fact that the project is not going ahead. Make up your minds, my friends.

As far as the Alaska gas pipeline is concerned, I can only refer my friend to the statements issued by the partners in the Alaska gas pipeline in which they quite clearly and specifically declared that their plan is still to proceed with the project and that they wanted to use the next while to arrange for the financing of the project, since the detailed engineering was sufficiently advanced to proceed. That was the statement of the partners in the project on the weekend, and I refer my hon. friend to it.

**Mr. Waddell:** While the Alsands matter is serious enough for the minister, the minister should, under British parliamentary tradition, offer his resignation forthwith since he stuck out his neck on the pre-build.

## STATEMENT MADE BY PIPELINE COMMISSIONER

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Madam Speaker, Mr. Mitchell Sharp, the pipeline commissioner, was quoted this weekend as saying that the sponsors of the project must "provide solid evidence this project is not just being put on hold" and that without such evidence Canadian support, which