

studies have all been completed; they are all in the past. It is a simple case of going through the studies and marking down the three or four points the people of Banff should properly know. I do not think the government wants to withhold that information. At one point I asked the parliamentary secretary why I was not getting an answer. He said he would do his very best, but I cannot understand, for the life of me, what is holding up Parks Canada in regard to answering this question.

In the meantime, more studies are going on, but we do not even know what studies have already been completed. I urge the hon. parliamentary secretary to put a little fire under whoever is supposed to get these answers.

Mr. Towers: Madam Speaker, I suppose we all have our wishes, but I just wish the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) could exchange places with one of my constituents who is facing charges in the Supreme Court of Canada as a result of government policy regarding its metric conversion program. My question No. 811 has been on the Order Paper since May 8 of last year.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Towers: It is a simple question. I feel sorry for the parliamentary secretary because I think the Metric Commission is hanging him out to dry; they are not giving him the answers. This is the fifth time I have asked this question. I think my constituents have a right to an answer. Not only are they paying the costs, they are facing court charges. My question No. 811 reads as follows:

1. By year, what was the total amount of funds disbursed on the metric conversion programme?
2. (a) How many persons are employed under the programme (b) how many man-years are allocated to the programme?
3. (a) How many contract employees or consultants are employed under the programme (b) what was the total amount of funds disbursed, by year, on contract employees or consultants?
4. (a) How many contracts with consultants has the metric programme (b) who are the recipients of the contracts and what is the total amount of their emolument, by year?
5. What was the total amount of money disbursed to date, for paid media advertising to publicize or promote the metric conversion programme?
6. How many letters of comment has the Metric Commission received from concerned Canadians regarding the implementation of the programme and how many were letters (a) of complaint (b) praising the programme?
7. Are weights and measures that have been adopted in the Canadian metric conversion programme fully compatible and interchangeable with weights and measures used by other nations which use the metric system (b) is the Canadian "tonne" fully interchangeable with all other nations?—

* * *

● (2200)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton. It is ten o'clock.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): When I asked the House business question earlier today, which the hon. member for

Adjournment Debate

Mississauga South followed up, the government House leader was somewhat imprecise as to what the government's business would be for tomorrow—

Some hon. Members: It is ten o'clock!

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): He indicated that it might be the borrowing authority bill or it might be something else. I wonder if the Government House Leader can tell us—if he can tell us now—what he intends to bring forward tomorrow.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, when orders of the day are called we will try to move our motion to limit time allocation on the Constitution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 40, a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved.

[English]

ENERGY—DELAY IN CONSTRUCTION OF TAR SANDS PLANT

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, on November 12 I asked a question of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) concerning the National Energy Program and the dispute which had arisen between the province of Alberta and the federal government concerning energy pricing. I suggested to the minister that he should try to seek an arrangement with the minister of energy for the province of Alberta and that the question of the hold on tar sands and heavy oil plants, which Alberta had placed on these plants, be separated from the general negotiations relating to the pricing of oil, and revenue-sharing with respect to oil.

I suggested that at that time, because of a number of factors. The national resources and public works committee, of which I am a member, in its deliberations last fall discussed the very matter of heavy oils and tar sands. The committee held a number of discussions and meetings with the various companies involved. It became apparent to us that we were dealing with a massive program. The initial tar sands plant, the Syncrude plant, cost \$2 billion or \$3 billion, but the two plants which are now being discussed will cost some \$8 billion to \$10 billion and are not something in immediate play in terms of production but, rather, are long-term projects which will take several years to construct. They will require massive amounts of money to construct.

It seemed to me that the dispute between the federal and provincial governments with respect to oil pricing and revenue-sharing would be long settled one way or another before these plants ever come into production. I thought that would be a