

Mr. Mazankowski: Is it any wonder that there is a feeling of alienation and a sense of frustration, both political and economic?

Mr. Cousineau: It is still Canadian oil.

Mr. Mazankowski: Westerners cannot understand why they must pay at least internationally competitive prices and in many cases more for commodities which are sold to them from eastern and central Canada. We do not mind that. That is fair, but what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. It is a reciprocating deal.

This government gets down on its hands and knees and pleads with Mexico to sell us more oil at the world price. What benefit does that give Alberta, western Canada, or any region of Canada? I do not understand the eagerness. At the same time hon. members opposite deny oil price increases to realistic levels. As a result they are scuttling development. They are scuttling megaprojects which are very important. As a matter of fact I am told that the deferral of two megaprojects, the oil sands and the Gold Lake heavy oil project, is costing the Canadian economy some \$25 million every day. There is dislocation and unemployment.

On July 7 *The Globe and Mail* pointed out that any development in Alberta reaps benefits for the whole of Canada, and particularly for the province of Ontario. The article to which I refer reads in part as follows:

Let us say that the oil price rises to the point where tar sands oil is economically feasible. One \$7 billion Alberta oil sands plant would mean, to Ontario alone: \$800 million for the iron and steel industry; \$370 million for metal-working firms; \$325 million for the transportation industry; \$740 million for other manufacturers and processors; \$750 million for the trade and service sector. That money would be working in the community producing consumer demands, making jobs, increasing government revenues.

Mr. Forrestall: And more dollars for us in eastern Canada.

Mr. Mazankowski: I will get to that. My colleague says "more dollars for eastern Canada", and that is true.

In total... one \$7 billion project like the proposed Alsands plant (now in doubt because of Liberal hesitation about oil prices) would generate \$23.8 billion in economic activity. Of that Alberta would get \$10.5 billion, Ontario \$6.2 billion, Quebec \$2.9 billion, and the other provinces the rest. "This is just one project. By the end of the century there could be another six similar projects plus one major expansion." For eastern offshore projects other provinces would take the Alberta share.

That is what is being held up as a result of the footdragging and waffling that is going on.

Mr. McKnight: More than we got from the F-18.

Mr. Mazankowski: What is tragic, in my view, is that we have a Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who is not really the right kind of person to be negotiating an oil arrangement. I think he is too far abrasive and far too arrogant. Some have suggested that he has about as much negotiating skill as Idi Amin. He has fueled the flames of division and suspicion, and that does not augur well. We hear much about this minister suggesting that Alberta is not sharing, and that it is not prepared to share. That rings a rather sympathetic tune with consumers in central and eastern Canada, but the fact is

Borrowing Authority Act

that Alberta has shared, is sharing and will continue to share with the rest of Canada. What has happened is that these deliberate and antagonistic statements do not augur well for the future unity of the country, and certainly it is not in keeping with the euphoria after the recent victory in the province of Quebec. When the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources suggested that Albertans merely occupy a territory, I found it an insult to our forefathers who came west when there was nothing but prairie and bush, and through sheer hard work and determination built a region and a province.

• (2030)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Certainly we are fortunate to have oil under our soil, but when these resources were developed eastern financial interests turned their backs on western Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: That can be well documented; it should not be overlooked.

An hon. Member: What has come over you?

Mr. Mazankowski: I feel strongly about this because the other side of the story must be told. The member's minister has been going about this country peddling a lot of bull, as we would say in Alberta. If we want to talk about sharing, since 1973 Alberta has forgone in excess of \$17 billion in revenue as a result of the underpricing of its oil. That is worth \$8,500 for every man, woman and child in the province of Alberta. That is sharing. Is it prepared to share? The answer is yes.

Under the arrangement worked out by our government, out of every \$4 per barrel increase, \$1.60 would have gone to the province, \$1.24 to the federal government, and \$1.16 to the industry, which would have represented a 50 per cent increase in federal government coffers. In addition it is important to note that Alberta agreed to phase in the increase in oil prices up to 85 per cent of the American price or world price over a period of time. It agreed to sell its natural gas to existing markets in central Canada at 85 per cent of the oil equivalent price and 65 per cent to any new markets for a period of five years. It further agreed to fund the extension of the gas pipeline from Montreal to Quebec City. Alberta agreed to accelerate oil sands development, pay for the infrastructure and invest \$3 billion to \$4 billion from the heritage trust fund in new oil sands plants to produce oil not for Albertans but for the rest of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: In addition, Alberta agreed to help finance five major energy projects in other provinces. Also it agreed to lend \$2 billion over five years to a National Energy Bank. As well, it agreed to certain tax changes in oil companies which would channel an additional \$400 million from Alberta to Ottawa.