

Government Orders

dollars per job created is incredibly high by any kind of economic average. But I assume that this too will be the subject of extensive study in the committee.

In that committee, we will also be looking at the question of royalties and tax revenues that will accrue to the provinces involved and to the federal government. Many people doubt the glowing estimates that were made just a few years ago, and they have reason to.

If I may, I would like to return to the question of the government funding, especially in light of Section 3(2)(a)(i) in each of the bills. Those are the sections in each of the bills that mandate the gifts of money, the \$1.04 billion for the Hibernia project and the \$425 million for the OSLO project. These are gifts. This is free money. No strings attached. It is an incredible thing. I have not really encountered anything like it before.

At the Ottawa Airport this afternoon when the plane came in I was talking very briefly to a member of the government benches who expressed surprise to me when I told him that this was not equity for the federal government, these were gifts. We get nothing in return for this \$425 million and \$1.04 billion. That is absolutely astonishing. Even in Alberta we know from our experience with the Syncrude project that you can get equity in an energy megaproject for the government that is shelling out the money. We did that in Alberta with Syncrude. That, too, is something to which we will be paying very close attention in the committee study of these bills.

I would like to conclude by reviewing the four conditions for these projects that my party set in a news release and background paper on November 7, 1989, the same day the minister introduced Bills C-44 and C-45.

The government is obviously going to press ahead with these bills. Consequently we want to have on record for the government's consideration, as well as the consideration of others, those four very constructive suggestions that, I will note, received the approval of the energy and environment critic for the federal New Democratic Party in this House, and as well, of the energy and environment critics of the New Democratic Party in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta—that all four of these individuals could come to an agreement on anything is little short of miraculous; in this instance, I think it doubly so.

Let me note very clearly that we are not opposed in principle to these two projects. We are opposed to the fiscal arrangements set out in the bills, and we are opposed to the government's energy policy generally because of the lack of cognizance it takes of environmental concerns.

However, with specific regard to the two projects, the following four conditions constitute the minimum acceptable for the projects to enjoy the support of the New Democratic Party.

First, no investment of public money without equivalent equity held by the Crown.

Second, guarantees, in the agreements among the parties, that production costs will not be subsidized, now or in the future, by the public purse, unless, I will note, such floor price subsidization applies to all oil and gas production in the country.

Third, the immediate restoration by the federal government of expenditures on research into, and development and commercialization of, energy alternatives and conservation up to a minimum of the \$400 million budget in 1984.

Fourth, concrete steps and guarantees to minimize the environmental impacts of the projects, including: (a) complete, thorough, joint federal-provincial environmental impact assessments, with extensive consequent public hearings featuring full intervenor funding, to be undertaken in each instance prior to any project commencement; (b) in addition to all measures implemented or planned for the purpose of reducing Canada's CO₂ emissions by 20 per cent by the year 2005, the further reduction of CO₂ emissions, principally through conservation and greatly enhanced use of fuel ethanol and propane, to a degree equal to the total CO₂ emissions from the projects, such that the projects result in no net increase in Canadian CO₂ emissions; and, (c), the use of best available technologies for pollution abatement and emissions control, especially with regard to CO₂ and SO₂.

These are not unreasonable conditions. In fact, these are conditions that I think most Canadians, on reflection, would find not only warrantable but indeed necessary.

I would just note that because the government at the moment cannot for whatever reason see its way clear to accepting these conditions, especially with regard to these two projects, we cannot, in conscience, accept the principle of the fiscal arrangements set out in the bills