

*Energy, Mines and Resources*

for Canada can be found, at least in part, in the alternative energy committee study and recommendations, and yet it has been ignored. There has not been one official statement about the whole thing.

This afternoon in debate on an earlier bill the minister beat his breast about Canertech. He said it is a tremendous thing and will do everything for everybody, including people who live in foreign countries. What money was provided for Canertech? For alternatives and conservation \$20 million was provided and perhaps \$15 million to spend overseas.

**Mr. Waddell:** Six thousand five hundred million for PIPs.

**Mr. Rose:** Let me put this in perspective. The cost to Mobil for drilling one dry well off the coast of Labrador was \$30 million. What the minister is prepared to put into Canertech is roughly equal to Mobil's one dry well. That points out to me the bias toward the supply side.

Why are we not doing these things? Why are we not putting more money into alternatives, conservation and renewables? The answer is that we are suffering from megamania. Marc's megamania: that is the objective. That is the policy of the government, from Senator Bud Olson right on down. First there is oil megamania. The government is throwing money at the multinationals to develop tar sands without even demanding equivalent equity for the investment. We can talk about Syncrude, Alsands or strikes by the oil companies. It does not matter; the government will put up the bucks. The people of Canada will put up the bucks, and the multinationals will get the equity. If the model is Syncrude, we can see that is what will happen. The problem now is that the price of oil has fallen. There is an oil glut, and all the big high rollers are bailing out because 19 per cent is not good enough for them.

The next is nuclear megamania. Whether we are underfunding solar programs, PUSH and the super insulation program, there is a great grab bag of strange cabinet ministers going all over the world trying to sell the Candu reactor to "democracies" such as Egypt, Argentina of recent fame, Kuwait and Korea. And with loan financing; it would make the average house buyer turn green. We are giving it to them at 7 per cent or so.

**Mr. Fulton:** Two per cent.

**Mr. Rose:** Effectively 7 per cent. No. The government borrows money at 16 per cent and gives it to Mexico for 7 per cent if they will only buy our reactor, which they will not. Nobody will. I think the total we wrote off last year was \$800 million to AECL debt, and this year we are continuing that crazy budget of two-thirds of our research budget in energy going to nuclear. In total, we have spent over \$4 billion on the nuclear program.

I could mention coal megamania in British Columbia, where the federal government is going to put up \$1 billion. It puts up \$20 million for Canertech but \$1 billion to Northeast Coal or 1,000 million.

**Mr. Fulton:** Subsidizing the export of cheap coal.

**Mr. Rose:** Subsidize anybody; that is their middle name.

**Mr. MacBain:** Mark "Subsidize".

**Mr. Rose:** We could call him "Marc Subsidize Lalonde".

**Mr. MacBain:** I was talking about Mark Rose, by the way.

**Mr. Rose:** We subsidize practically every form of energy there is. I have here a little study entitled "Energy Reference Cost Premiums—A Draft Working Paper". I am glad the hon. member brought this up. This was a study undertaken in 1980 for the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. The study attempted to show the real cost of oil, natural gas and electricity as opposed to the cost the consumer was actually paying. The author of this paper came to the conclusion that for every dollar of oil products Canadians bought at the pump in 1980 the actual cost should have been \$1.65. The people in my riding do not object to that because if they have to drive miles and miles to work, they are rather pleased their cost is subsidized.

The study also talks about natural gas. We are probably paying about one third of the actual cost. If we want to talk about electricity, the cost depends on the province involved, but the price is probably 20 per cent to 50 per cent of the cost. We do not object to the subsidizing of energy, but if we are going to subsidize energy—and I did not even talk about nuclear energy—let us subsidize all forms of energy, including solar, so that we can create many more jobs. We need to commercialize solar now. We need to move from the beginning, experimental to the manufacturing stages. Do hon. members know what the sales over last year in active solar in the world were? They were something like \$4 billion. Are we in on that? We are in on it very little, but that is the way we should be going.

What I am saying is that there is not enough money to develop the alternatives. The hon. member for Niagara Falls will recall that no province in Canada will see by 1990 more than 5 per cent of its energy coming from any kind of alternative, so in spite of this window we have between, for example, 1990 and 2000 and in spite of the time we have to prepare the oil sands plants, gasohol plants, methanol plants and all the other alternatives, we are not doing anything nearly enough to balance Canada energy systems. We are still spending all our money on PIP programs and running around poking holes in the bottom of the sea, regardless of the consequences.

• (2150)

I think the government has ignored the benefits we can get from conservation and renewables. Why should we prefer the alternatives and the renewables, Mr. Speaker? First of all, because they are benign; they are decentralized; they do not pollute the air or water as do coal and thermal plants, and they are labour intensive. For about \$100,000 or about \$50,000 they can provide a job, compared with the almost \$1 million it takes to produce a permanent job in the tar sands plants. There is a regional distribution of jobs. People can work on the spot and not have to travel to and fro or live in some trailer