I would remind the House that what we are talking about here is very minuscule compared to what has occurred in the last four years. The Hon. Member wants to talk about high costs. Let us apply that to tourism. In the four-year period between 1980 and 1984 the cost of gasoline rose by 75.5 per cent. I am sure that had an impact on the tourist industry. The cost of transportation rose by 56 per cent during the four-year period that the Hon. Member was a member of the Government. The cost of alcoholic beverages, a cost which some associate with tourism, rose by 43 per cent. Those are components of the tourist industry. However, the 75 per cent increase in the cost of gasoline is a far cry from the modest increase that we placed on the tourist industry. I think the Hon. Member should recognize that as well.

Inspection fees are under the purview of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise). I know that the Minister is now engaged in bilateral discussions with his provincial counterparts and representatives of the agricultural industry trying to work out a better arrangement to ensure that there can be some compromise. I am not fully aware of all the details, but I am aware that the Minister has received many of those representations and I am positive that he will be acting on them.

**Mr. Manly:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister referred to the new energy deal that was worked out with the western provinces. At the heart of that is the whole question of de-control of prices by which the price of old oil, brought on stream before 1974, will rise some $6 or $7 a barrel and the price of new oil will probably be brought down a bit. The net effect of this will be that the companies involved with old oil will pick up some $1.7 billion more or less and the companies that are involved with new oil will have their incomes decreased by about $500 million.

The fact is that the companies involved with old oil are largely the multinationals, while some of the smaller Canadian-controlled companies had a larger stake in the development and production of new oil. For example, 65 per cent of Texaco's production is of old oil. With Gulf, the figure is 70 per cent; with Shell, 75 per cent; with Mobil, 70 per cent and with Imperial, 50 per cent. The multinationals have a very large stake in old oil. Yet the policy that the Minister has lauded will have a detrimental effect on some of the smaller Canadian-controlled companies.

I would like to ask the Minister how he believes that this policy, which he thinks is so good, will really benefit Canada as a whole, and how it will benefit Canadian-owned or controlled oil companies which are not in control of old oil.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP talk about jobs, jobs, jobs. The National Energy Program which we dismantled cost Ontario 90,000 jobs and Alberta 70,000 jobs. I can cite figures for the entire country. What the Hon. Member is failing to recognize is that the new and smaller oil companies to which he is referring are not complaining about the new western energy accord. In fact, it quite delights them by virtue of the fact that the PGRT is literally removed on all new production, and particularly on enhanced recovery, the tarsands and those kinds of facilities. Those are the basic job generators.

In so far as the multinationals are concerned, the PGRT will be phased out; they will have to continue to pay it, albeit on a phased-out basis. We will have a taxation system in this country. If the Hon. Member is suggesting that there are some deficiencies in the tax system, perhaps I might agree with him, but that does not necessarily mean that we have to put in place a whole series of alphabet soup programs which no one really understands, which cost millions upon millions of dollars to administer, which strangle the industry and which take away the potential for job creation, economic development and wealth generation.

Generally speaking, the Western Accord has been heralded as a major breakthrough for Canada. There may be some imperfections in the system but there are a heck of a lot fewer imperfections in this system than there were in the old one.

● (1650)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal-Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), condemning the Conservative Government for its indifference to providing regional development assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) told us about his interest in and satisfaction with the agreement on energy policies concerning the multinationals in Western Canada. I only hope that the Budget to be brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) will not include tax provisions to help the multinationals which will no longer have to pay as much in corporate taxes and that the consumers will not have to pay the cost of this new policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not share the views of the Minister of Transport, because I think Quebec is going to pay the bill. I realize the Minister could not care or less, since he is from Western Canada and is going to get all the jobs and we in the province of Quebec are going to pay the piper. I am sorry, but my first duty is to defend the interests of Quebec within Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House what this Government did as soon as it came to power. First of all, on November 8, the Minister of Finance cut more than $770 million from projects that were to be carried out this year in Quebec. Some of these projects come under the Minister of Transport, such as VIA Rail. A number of major projects were to be implemented in the area around Trois-Rivières, at Victoriaville—this was a pharmaceutical laboratory. There was also the natural gas branch line program worth $85 million, and now that money will not go into Quebec's economy, and there are the jobs that have been lost as well. I could mention