

indicates that Canada approves or supports the Pol Pot regime. In that case, what does this vote mean? On the one hand, it means that we have forgotten what all the countries which made up the United Nations shortly after its establishment had sworn never to forget, namely the horrors revealed by the skeletal survivors of Hitler's camps.

[English]

I see that my time is running out, but I have more to say. There have been a number of tragedies with regard to our treatment of Vietnam. We have made mistakes and we are continuing to make mistakes. I cannot believe that Vietnam is not ready to come to some sort of accommodation on Cambodia. She is prepared to come to terms with her neighbours. The present course recommended to Canada by Vietnam's southeast Asian neighbours will inevitably fail. It will make Vietnam even more dangerous. Most important of all, it will prolong indefinitely the human tragedy in Cambodia.

● (2205)

If anyone at the United Nations should speak for the tortured and dispossessed Cambodians, Canada with its image of a protector of the underdog should. It is obscene to have gone along once again with the Vietnam bashing that seems to have become the habit over the last 15 years by our friends south of the border. That elusive Vietnam victory has caused innumerable tortures for the Cambodian people. I would suggest to the minister tonight, in the name of human decency, that the next time the UN considers the matter, Canada remain neutral, that we do not cast our vote in such a way as to take sides. The southeast Asian situation is one we should keep clear of unless we are there on behalf of a humane, decent solution that will benefit the people of Cambodia.

**Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has supported the seating of democratic Kampuchea in the United Nations General Assembly, because to have done otherwise would have lent legitimacy to the invasion and occupation of Kampuchea by the armed forces of a neighbouring country. This action does not imply Canadian government approval for the Democratic Kampuchean regime of Pol Pot or Canadian acquiescence in the abhorrent human rights abuses perpetrated by that regime during its tenure in power. In 1978, Canada played a leading role in denouncing the deplorable human rights record of Democratic Kampuchea. This was done by a submission to the UN Commission on Human Rights and by subsequent statements in the UN General Assembly.

The unseating of the Democratic Kampuchean regime in the United Nations might have been interpreted as a move towards the legitimization of aggression and the use of force by one nation to overthrow the government of another. This is why Canada along with a majority in the United Nations General Assembly last autumn voted for the continued seating of Democratic Kampuchea, much as we dislike what that regime did when it was the undisputed government in Kampuchea. It has been made clear that Canada would not be

### *Adjournment Debate*

involved in any effort to restore the Pol Pot government to power.

Current efforts to seek a peaceful solution to this situation in Kampuchea are centred on the International Conference currently taking place in accordance with the United Nations General Assembly resolution of last autumn. Vietnam and U.S.S.R. are not attending the conference. In the circumstances, it is recognized that the conference will not be able to provide definitive solutions to the problems in Kampuchea.

Canada believes that the proposals presented to the conference, which include a cease fire agreement among the conflicting parties, the creation of a United Nations peacekeeping force, the supervised withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea, and the holding of United Nations supervised free elections, are sound proposals which could offer the necessary guarantees for the parties involved. Canada is prepared to give serious consideration to these proposals but recognizes that they may need amendment or adjustment. They are, however, a first step in the right direction. It is also hoped that the conference will establish a framework for continuing discussions, which will, hopefully, in time, as the situation evolves, lead to genuine negotiations by the parties directly involved in the situation in Kampuchea.

#### ENERGY—FUTURE OF ALSANDS PROJECT AT FORT McMURRAY, ALBERTA (A) POSSIBLE COMMERCIAL ARRANGEMENT WITH OIL COMPANIES

**Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to question a reply given to me in response to a question I asked on July 13. I asked specifically if he was working on a commercial agreement with the companies currently contemplating development in the tar sands in northeastern Alberta, particularly Imperial Oil and the Alsands consortium. The minister replied:

As far as the question of arriving at a satisfactory commercial arrangement is concerned, this is what we are negotiating with the government of Alberta at the present time.

● (2210)

Nothing could be more blatantly false than that statement. I must point out that a commercial arrangement must be made with the participating companies. Those companies are willing to invest at this point \$12 billion in each of two separate plants, but they first must know what they will get for their production, what the taxing regime will be and what the royalty structure will be so that they can do an ordinary cash flow study and determine whether they will get a rate of return on this massive investment of \$12 billion per plant in order to make it economically viable.

Both the Alsands consortium in Fort McMurray and Imperial Oil with respect to the project at Cold Lake have clearly indicated to this government and to the government of Alberta that they must have a rate of return of 20 per cent on a discounted cash flow basis because in the case of Imperial Oil it is investing nearly its total net worth in this project. It is