

Oral Questions

Mr. Cosgrove: However, I would hasten to advise the hon. member that I am sure she must have overlooked the fact that the CHIP program was transferred into the auspices of energy, mines and resources earlier this year.

Mr. Clark: Like the Department of Finance!

Mr. Cosgrove: I would like to remind the hon. member of the reply given by the minister just a few days ago in this House that, indeed, a special committee of cabinet is presently looking at the many problems raised in the question put by the hon. member. First of all, we are concerned to know the extent of the problem. We are concerned to know that a response in a scientific way is one which has a certain certitude and is not haphazard. As the minister indicated, the government has this actively under consideration. I would expect that within a few weeks we will be able to give a definitive answer.

Mrs. Mitchell: As usual, this minister is passing the buck and refusing to take any initiatives.

COMPENSATION TO MEET COST OF REMOVAL

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): My second supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Home owners who are afflicted by urea formaldehyde gas cannot live in their homes; they cannot sell them because they are useless; they are worried about their children who have bad health problems, in many cases; and most of them have their life savings in their homes. Will the minister, in view of this tragedy, approve a compensation program for home owners so that they can remove this hazardous insulation and be paid for it by the government which contributed to the problem?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General): Madam Speaker, I would remind the hon. member that the matter is now under review by an interdepartmental committee and that within a few days, we shall announce a series of measures that will specifically meet the expectations of the people, and that will indeed allow us to assess the exact extent of the problem.

I would submit to the hon. member that it is absolutely useless to make the kind of statement she has been making about Canadians that are now supposed to be ill. We will check the facts and the government will face its responsibilities only as far as it is bound to, nothing more and nothing less.

* * *

[English]

ENERGY

FUTURE INCREASE IN PRICE OF CRUDE OIL

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Madam Speaker, I would like to seek some clarification, if I may, from

the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Some of us were under the impression that, in the absence of any agreement with Alberta or the other producing provinces, there was to be a further increase of \$1 a barrel on crude oil as of July 1 of this year. Did I understand the minister correctly to say that that will not take place at that time but will instead take place on the 1st of September? If Alberta again cuts back production we can, of course, expect a further increase of another \$1 a barrel on the 1st of September. Would there then be an increase of \$2 a barrel as of the 1st of September, 1981, in the absence of any agreement?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Obviously, if the government of Alberta introduces another cutback on the 1st of September, we will have to provide compensation for that unfortunate decision. As far as the first question is concerned, the budget announced an increase of \$1 a barrel effective the 1st of July, but it will be delayed for 60 days before it reaches the consumer through the refinery process. Therefore that increase will not come into effect until the 1st of September, as far as the consumer is concerned. No other increase is planned, at least until the 1st of September.

FEDERAL SHARE OF INCREASE

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Perhaps the minister could correct my rather poor arithmetic. The way I then compute it, there will have been a total increase in September, of the total price of crude oil per barrel in 1981, which will be close to \$10 a barrel by next fall. The federal government will be collecting approximately \$8 out of that \$10. Could the minister confirm those figures for me, please?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I think the calculations of the hon. member are excessive.

An hon. Member: Give us yours!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lalonde: I would like to remind the hon. member that, out of whatever total figure he has in mind, about \$3, or somewhat over \$3, would be the result of the Alberta cutbacks, a decision by that provincial government. In addition, there are \$2 which go to the wellhead, to the producing provinces. Therefore I suggest that my hon. friend bear those facts in mind in making his calculations.

Mr. Clark: What are your estimates?