

advertising. More often than not, Opposition Members complain when the Government uses television or newspaper ads to inform the public.

\* \* \*

[English]

## ENERGY

### REQUEST FOR GASOLINE TAX REDUCTION

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy who should know, and he should tell the House and the people of Canada, that domestic crude oil is being provided to the refiner at a level of 75 per cent or less of the world price, while at the same time the retail price exceeds the world level. This is primarily because of the onerous federal tax of 14.4 cents per litre, or about 65 cents a gallon. The price of gasoline to the consumer could come down if the federal Government reduced its take. Why does the Minister not get in step with world reality and recommend to his Cabinet colleagues a reduction in the onerous federal taxes on the price of energy so that consumers in Canada will get a break?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, I made that argument many times. In our agreement with the Government of Alberta in September, 1981, it was provided that Canadians were to have a price lower than the world price. That was the agreement, and the goal the Government was seeking at that time.

After we had an agreement with the Government of Alberta and the producing Provinces, the provincial Governments stepped in to add on a very big ad valorem tax which took away the advantage the energy program was to provide to Canadian consumers. I say publicly that I have a lot of sympathy for the argument of Premier Lougheed because, at that time, he made an agreement between the federal Government, the producing Provinces, and the provincial Governments on the take from a barrel of oil. But later on, the consuming Provinces added a very big ad valorem tax, so big in Quebec that the Quebec provincial Government is getting much more money from oil coming from Alberta than the Government of Alberta. There is a valid point there and I want to discuss that with Mr. Lougheed. But at the same time the agreement provided for increases and decreases in prices according to the world market price, and that is the point we are debating at this time with Alberta.

● (1500)

### GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Madam Speaker, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is refusing to recognize that the federal Government is getting about 65 cents per gallon in the form of taxes and, therefore, the consumer of oil and gasoline in Canada is not receiving the benefit of the oil pricing arrangement with the Province of Alberta. Why does the Minister not come clean and explain to

### *Business of the House*

the Canadian people why the Government refuses to reduce the federal tax to be commensurate with the world market place?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, for every litre of gasoline sold in Ontario at the present time the federal Government receives about 21 per cent of the price; 30 per cent goes to the Government of Ontario; some goes to the Government of Alberta; some to the producer, and a good part of it goes to the distributor and refiner. So 21 per cent of the cost of a litre of gasoline in Ontario goes to the federal Government; that is 9 per cent less that goes to the provincial Government of Ontario which has nothing to do with this agreement.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, this being Thursday, I would ask the Government House Leader to give us some indication of the business of the House for the balance of the week and for next week.

**Mr. Pinard:** First of all, Madam Speaker, to deal with tomorrow, under the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Section 20, we have to start debate within a certain period of time on objections to reports made by different commissions. Tomorrow we have no choice but to allow that to happen. The first item of business tomorrow will be to take up the consideration of the four objections that appear on the Order Paper, as I indicated to my colleagues yesterday, for a maximum of one hour. At the end of one hour, if debate has not been completed, we on this side will agree to continue debate at a further date which will be determined later.

You will recall that in 1976 there was agreement among the Parties to start debate for five minutes and then adjourn it until later, but failing such an accord this year we have no choice but to start debate. We want that debate to last one hour and then at the end of the hour debate will be adjourned until a later time that will be agreed between the Parties.

At the expiry of that hour we will call a Bill which is to be introduced today and which we hope to get through all stages, the Small Businesses Loans Act which will allow small business to get loans after March 30. If we approve that Bill before the end of the day, the back-up Bill will be Bill C-136 at report stage, which is a budget Bill.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, as far as the business of the House next week is concerned, I may point out that Monday will be an Opposition day—the last day in this supply period. This is in response to the wishes of the Parliamentary House Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party who did not want it to be next Friday. I am certainly willing to accommodate him, as a courtesy, and thus designate Monday as an Opposition day. In addition, there will be one or more votes at the end of the day