

*Oral Questions***NATURAL RESOURCES****LOW SULPHUR WESTERN COAL—RECOMMENDED USAGE BY ONTARIO HYDRO**

**Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South):** Mr. Speaker, western Canada's coal industry is in difficulty following attempts to sell larger quantities of coal in a depressed and increasingly competitive international market. The recent federal-provincial task force may have indicated a way for our coal producers to broaden their marketing opportunities. Using low sulphur western coal in place of high sulphur American coal would allow Ontario Hydro to meet future limits on acid gas emissions, without resorting to flue scrubbers. The drawback is that Ontario consumers will pay somewhat more for their electricity, a cost differential which could, however, be reduced by initiatives noted in the report.

I urge both levels of Government to investigate the potential for marketing more western Canadian coal in Ontario, as this can provide economic benefits to all Canadians at little or no extra cost to the electricity consumers.

\* \* \*

**CANADA SAVINGS BONDS****PAYMENT MADE TO FORMER BOND HOLDER**

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that I may have discovered one of the many reasons that the Government of Canada has been unable to deal effectively with Canada's large deficit. It appears that the Government may be sending out volumes of Canada Savings Bonds interest cheques to people who are not eligible, or expecting them.

In October, 1985, Mr. William Fader of Chase, British Columbia, cashed in his Canada Savings Bonds, yet he received a cheque for \$450 on November 1, 1986. How many other cheques of this nature have been sent to Canadians more than a year after they cashed in their Canada Savings Bonds? Is the Government sending out cheques for hundreds of dollars to surprise Canadians, such as Mr. Fader, as special Christmas presents, or has the Government blown it and once again demonstrated its fiscal incompetence and its inability to deal with important financial issues facing Canada?

\* \* \*

**NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION****LOCATION OF AIR TRAINING BASE—CLAIM ADVANCED ON BEHALF OF LABRADOR**

**Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, NATO will be making a decision within the next few weeks as to whom to award a new \$500 million air training base. There are only two nations, Canada and Turkey, that are competing for this

facility. Canada must continue to lobby hard for the base to be awarded to Labrador, since it will provide this area with badly needed economic stimulation. This base will provide for more than 500 permanent jobs, and it will inject enormous amounts of capital into the local economy.

● (1415)

Since all aircraft will be requiring service, and today's aircraft require highly skilled technical personnel, the potential technological spinoff to Canada and the local community will be of benefit in enticing high technology industry around the proposed base. Goose Bay could also provide NATO with a more secure location.

The Government of Canada, Members of Parliament, and our ambassadors should continue to use every means at their disposal to secure the base, for it will help an area of the nation which needs economic stimulation, and will provide security for our NATO allies.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES****REFURBISHING MINISTERS' OFFICES**

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, once again Ministers of the Tory Government are abusing taxpayers with their excessive spending in refurbishing their offices following the last ministerial shuffle.

Most of us did not know that a cabinet shuffle meant a boondoggle for movers. I wonder whether the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) could justify to the House the expenditure of \$33,000 so that the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) could satisfy her fetish of having an office away from a junior Minister. Is that what the Prime Minister meant when he said: "Watch Pat Carney go"? Did he mean from Tower B to Tower A?

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**SOVEREIGNTY****BEAUFORT SEA—OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION LICENCES—REPORTED ACTION BY UNITED STATES**

**Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Apparently the American Government is proposing to issue licences for the exploration of oil and gas in the Canadian segment of the Beaufort Sea. What is our Government doing to object to the procedure? What steps is Canada taking to protect its sovereignty in those waters?