

Oral Questions

Mr. Lalonde: British Columbia. I would also welcome those from Alberta, so if my hon. friend has extra copies of all these things we will certainly be very happy to look at them.

As far as the actual commitment of the Canadian government is concerned, the cabinet has taken a decision to co-operate in the implementation of this project. We have insisted on very strict rules in terms of avoiding the national government's subsidizing the export of natural resources. We have held to that very firmly, and we are happy to see that the deal seems to have been made without the federal government's having to subsidize the export of natural resources, which we said we would not do.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, I wish the minister would do some reading on this deal and do some work on it, because he is facing another possible sellout like the Columbia River treaty. There is \$450 million of federal money involved, and perhaps up to \$1 billion including B.C. taxpayers' money.

Is it the policy of the government to subsidize the export of non-renewable resources, and will the minister table in this House the documents the federal government has on this deal? Will the government table environmental studies and financial studies with respect to this potentially quite disastrous deal?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I might try to answer this question. Yesterday a paper was issued in Vancouver by Senator Olson, who is in charge of this matter, in which he revealed exactly the terms of the agreement as far as the federal government is concerned.

The first part has to do with some \$207 million which CN will invest in this project. That is on a cost-recoverable basis. It is on a commercial basis.

The second item has to do with a federal guarantee of a \$3 per tonne throughput at the port of Prince Rupert until the year 1989, and that is indexed to the consumer price index from May, 1980, to 1989. Then after 1989 the matter becomes totally commercial, and if there was any financial support needed to make the \$3 per tonne throughput possible in the period 1983-84 to 1989, then that help would be fully cost-recoverable after that time.

The third element is about \$10 million of on-site and off-site services and access roads, and that is the package which was put together in the grain agreement. The hon. member will remember that at that time it was anticipated that the coal project would become a reality at Prince Rupert. This was wrapped up at that time, and this is not on a cost-recoverable basis. Those are the facts.

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT**ALLEGED REJECTION OF GROS CACOUNA AS SITE FOR FUTURE NATURAL GAS LIQUEFACTION TERMINAL**

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Kamouraska-Rivière-du-Loup): Madam Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of the Environment, and as you seldom allow supplementary questions, I would greatly appreciate it if the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources could also make a few comments. In a Canadian Press item released last evening, the Minister of the Environment is reported as having said:

The federal Minister of the Environment, John Roberts, announced yesterday that the Canso Strait area had been rejected as a possible site for a natural gas liquefaction terminal.

Mr. Roberts explained that the decision to reject this site had been made by the private sector and not by the federal government.

The terminal will probably be built in Gros Cacouna, Quebec.

Can the minister confirm or deny this report of the Canadian Press and would he tell us whether he was speaking on behalf of the Canadian government when he made this announcement?

[English]

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. There is a clear explanation for the statement I made. It was a simple error on my part. I managed to confuse the province of New Brunswick with the province of Nova Scotia. It would be inexplicable to the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia that I confused one for the other. Indeed, it is almost inexplicable to myself.

The fact is that the statement was absolutely correct except that I should have said New Brunswick when I said Nova Scotia and Nova Scotia when I said New Brunswick. There has been no change in the situation. The site at Gros Cacouna and the site in Nova Scotia are both under the process of environmental review undertaken in each case by the province with the participation and co-operation of the federal government.

* * *

ENERGY**DECISION ON LOCATION OF LNG TERMINAL**

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on the same matter, that is, the decision with respect to the location of the liquid natural gas terminal at Gros Cacouna or in the Strait of Canso in Nova Scotia. Let me say first that I am surprised that the press gallery orches-