

[Home](#) | [Financial Post](#) | [News](#) |
[Opinion](#) | [Arts](#) | [Life](#) | [Sports](#) |
[Homes](#) | [Cars](#) | [Blogs](#) |
[Multimedia](#) | [Classifieds](#)

[Main](#) | [About](#) | [Contact Editor](#) |
[Subscribe RSS](#)

Alberta to U.S.: Use the oil sands or lose them
 Posted: August 31, 2009, 6:37 PM by Ron Nurwisah
[Don Martin](#), [Canadian politics](#), [alberta](#)



OTTAWA -- To lift a quip from Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Arctic sovereignty policy and apply it to the American view of Alberta's oil sands: use it or lose it.

The Chinese government pushed its shovel deep into Canada's energy motherlode on Monday when [it announced a \\$2-billion stake](#) in a five-billion-barrel reserve of "dirty oil" that Americans increasingly find unworthy of fuelling their vehicles.

The 60% claim by PetroChina in two projects owned by Athabasca Oil Sands Corp., while small compared to the great gobs of capital pouring into oil sands expansion and extraction, are the global giant's largest investment in Canadian energy yet.

And China usually buys into product it aims to consume.

Sources in Washington predict politicians there will not be pleased at having a massive supply of secure energy on their northern doorstep slipping under Chinese ownership.

Well, too bad.

Under the greenish Obama administration, "oil sands" is becoming a dirty word as Americans take on the delusional swagger that they can be picky about which oil is good enough to buy in a recession when supply is temporarily ahead of demand.

Canadian oil sands exports are increasingly encountering U.S. political resistance at federal, state and municipal levels as low-carbon fuel standards move through the legislative process to erect barricades against an energy with an extraction problem.

But it is delusional because there is no post-refining difference between conventional and non-conventional oil and banning it in one state or city merely moves it to another, with no corresponding reduction in carbon emissions.

Yet the difference between the American and Chinese views of oilsand

imports suggests that Canada is nearing a moment of decision.

It can be forever held captive to the whims of U.S. refineries, which import 60% of oilsand production or about 780,000 barrels a day. Or it can create a battle of demand between the two energy-consuming superpowers that will soon find there is not enough oil to satisfy their combined thirsts.

That will require Canada, whose pipelines now head only north and south, to punch a hole in the Rockies and open up a crude flow to the west coast, from where oil could head overseas.

Environment Minister Jim Prentice is no fan of a single-buyer market for exported bitumen, which actually sells at a discount in the U.S. compared to Middle East oil despite coming from a friendly neighbour. He'd like competition injected into the system.

“Doesn't it help Canada's exporter to have alternative market choices?,” he noted in a recent interview. “We need transportation mechanisms to ship it to the West Coast. Refineries in the U.S. have limited capacity and we don't have anywhere else to sell it. Having the capacity to ship it to the West Coast would keep everybody honest, so I think it's good policy.”

That's so obvious as to be rhetorical, but the cost and complications of a new west-bound pipeline may be prohibitive for the private sector to go it alone.

The proposed Enbridge Inc. Northern Gateway pipeline, which was been on ice for several years, is being thawed for reconsideration.

That's at least five years off and the project faces numerous environmental, aboriginal land claim and geographical hurdles, which is probably why they weren't talking it yesterday — although they weren't ruling it out in the longer term either.

But to understand China's strategic investment interest, keep in mind that 2009 will likely go down as the first year when car sales in the Communist country beat the United States, making it the world's largest car-buying nation.

At the risk of stating the obvious, cars consume gasoline, gasoline comes from oil and the world's largest deposits of oil, albeit locked in tar, straddle northern Alberta and Saskatchewan.

If America doesn't want to use it on environmental grounds, they're only one pipeline away from losing it to someone else.

National Post
dmartin@nationalpost.com

 BOOKMARK  [Comments \(98\)](#)  [Send to a friend](#)  [Permalink](#)

98 Comments

You must be logged in to post a comment

[Click here to post a comment](#)

by Rosemary1941

Aug 31 2009
7:20 PM

Points are well taken. We have been suffering too much from well meaning Environmentalists using false statistics and hype to address their cause.

Save our planet, of course, but to do it the way those giving "dirty oil" as an excuse, will only hurt rather than advance their cause.

We need oil and will for many years to come unless those using the "dirty oil" hype wish to use bicycles instead of their cars.

by MHartman

Aug 31 2009
7:24 PM

This is the first article of Don's that I've agreed with in some time. The first rule in macroeconomics is "don't let the customer have the leverage as he'll take all your profits". More customers is good for Canada. If the USA administration wants to play green politics, bring on different customers. I enjoy being a neighbour to the USA and hope our beneficial relationship continues far into our future. However, the current administration is playing economic/political games because the eco-hysteria plays well to an uninformed populace.

Fine, get your votes - it is 100% your choice. But not at Canada's economic loss. Bring on the new customers. Naturally, we'll welcome you back when you knock on the door, however there will be other customers in line.

by JFJ

Aug 31 2009
7:27 PM

Socialist economic policies coming out of the White House will have major negative downstream consequences for the US.

Obama is taking his country down the path to second-rate nationhood. Let's hope for our American neighbours that the damage he does is limited in the four years before he gets kicked out.

by

Hunteroffortune
Aug 31 2009
7:28 PM

You don't even need a pipeline in the short term, we have trains don't we, right across Canada, right through the rockies! CN might even see profits from it!

by IainGFoulds

Aug 31 2009
7:34 PM

... A rare decent contribution by Martin.

... Of course the Left will be against it. We certainly wouldn't want any foreign investment in our country at this time.

by JEST
Aug 31 2009
7:51 PM

Enviro-marxist policys will create mega problems for Obama. Just as they have for Europe. Canada needs to back away from this idiotic Climate- change hoax as soon as possible. Start in Copanhen in Dec.

by gwestbound
Aug 31 2009
7:56 PM

I am so tired of the U.S. jerking us around. Let's get started on a west coast pipeline tomorrow.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
7:58 PM

Canadas sovereignty is up for grabs to the highest bidder, Harper and co will sell the north out from under the feet of the inhabitants for personal gain to his political masters. Pillage and plunder of the Arctic resources with little or no return to the taxpayers just a bill for clean up when all is said and done. Bargain basement prices, half off everything in stock, yard sale.

by JEST
Aug 31 2009
8:07 PM

If Obama prefers the middle easts bloody oil to our so called dirty oil, so be it. There are obviously other markets.

by Capitalist
Aug 31 2009
8:36 PM

The term "dirty oil" is as senseless today as when it began being peddled by US environmentalists. Some devious US politicians are jumping on it (green hypocrites) while not believing a word of it. It is Alberta oil and it will be going to the people who want to buy it ... period!

by Huck9
Aug 31 2009
8:37 PM

I agree with Hunter of fortune, I've heard the rail argument and think the railways can be up and running to ship in no time.

For the first time I think ever I agree with Don Martin. Wow.

Great insight and yes we need to develop some competition here. Perhaps we will be treated with a bit more respect by the U.S.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
8:52 PM

BC made a losing deal with the Chinese and sold them coal, which they were converting to fuel, now China has banned converting coal to fuel so this nicely fits their needs, once again the taxpayers are being taken

to the cleaners by the Chinese and Harpers buddies will reap all the profit. Short term gain of long term pain or as it is seen from the Chinese side short term pain for long term gain. Stop shipping raw resources off shore, logs, coal, tarsands, and start converting the products in Canada create some jobs. quit selling the country out to the highest bidder.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
8:56 PM

We could sell the rail lines to the Chinese.

by Policy Analyst
Aug 31 2009
9:04 PM

It really bugs me when people on the right pretend that they are all about the "free market", but still really depend on public subsidy.

Martin even says "but the cost and complications of a new west-bound pipeline may be prohibitive for the private sector to go it alone." implying that tax payers should maybe kick in!

in a free market it is not in the job of government to invest in the business assets and development cost of a private market good and I am sick of my taxes going to subsidize the oil patch.

another great example is Alberta policy on royalty rates - lets set one of the lowest royalty rates in the world and basically give away our children's inheritance in the span of two decades! what a scam! private sector should be paying the full economic, social, and environmental costs of the products and services they sell - because that is truly a free market.

by eddyboy
Aug 31 2009
9:05 PM

i guess that Americans need to choose then. i mean you can't have the cake & eat it too. its supposed to be a free market isn't it ?

by Wildindigo
Aug 31 2009
9:10 PM

Somebody call the cops..Don Martin wrote an article and didn't bash the Conservatives.

Diversifying away from the convenient teat of the U.S. consumer will only make our great country better in the long run.

Don, don't be writing any more good articles like this. What's wrong with you anyway?

by JEST
Aug 31 2009

Policy Analyst, You may have noticed when Stelmach

9:23 PM

attempted to bleed the private sector with his "Fair Share" royalty review. Business fled the province. And with them went jobs, tax revenue and other trickle down economic benefits. Parasitic government is not part of any free market im aware of.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
9:24 PM

How can anyone claim this is a benefit when no one knows exactly what was purchased and what will change hands. What exactly does "other financial interests" mean.

by WCF
Aug 31 2009
9:29 PM

I jut love it when the "Greenies" talk dirty oil and the Chinese walk in and buy it all up. My first reaction is to make sure my two 500 gallon fuel storage tanks on the farm are full and my send reaction is to invest in more oil stock. You just know the yanks will see the trouble ahead and force the prices up. I see a \$3 a litre fuel bill soon....

by Fred Z
Aug 31 2009
9:32 PM

"Stop shipping raw resources off shore, logs, coal, tarsands, and start converting the products in Canada create some jobs."

OK, Fitzy, if it's so damn easy, get on with it. You do it and stop telling other people to do it. What, you can't? You don't have the expertise, money, ability or perseverance and you're just another bullshit artist? And I bet you want me to subsidize you or whatever lame brain you want to be in charge? Fancy that, whoda thunk it?

"quit selling the country out to the highest bidder." and what, start selling it to the lowest bidder? Very clever strategy. The kind of low bidder the Fitzies like always turn out to be incompetent buffoons who mismanage the asset into oblivion.

The Fitzies of the world never believe that Pemex, Petro-Canada, Petróleos de Venezuela or National Iranian Oil Company could possibly happen to their pet restraint of trade/protectionist ideas. Let's be like Iran, turn the assets over to Fitzy & co. and have a permanent, systemic, gasoline shortage. Nah, Canadians are perfect, except for Fitzies pet peevsters, and we'll manage nationalized assets perfectly, yup, yup, sure we will.

Fitzy, the power to impose non-resident taxes is the ultimate sovereignty as any Albertan who owns BC real estate knows. If the Chinese annoy us too much

we'll tax the property back into our hands.

This jobs claptrap bothers me too. Jobs are cost, not a benefit. They are a bug, not a feature. I want goods, services and money from the Chinese and I don't want no stinkin' jobs.

by AJR79
Aug 31 2009
9:38 PM

Jim Prentice is a good egg.

I think he'd make a great PM, and would probably win an easy majority.

by JETSOLVER
Aug 31 2009
9:50 PM

Whenever a thin blooded big L liberal like Don or Ignatieff comes sniffing around the oilpatch, older types like myself can feel the hairs on the back of our rednecks firm up. Sorry Don, we would much rather sell to even the morally lacking Chinese than you and yours...which should tell you something about us, and about you.

Back to the hustings Don, and hands out of our pockets. We didn't see any help from the great red tide the last time around, let alone when the money was flowing into the hill to be redistributed in little brown bags to your buddies, so excuse us if we don't buy your snake oil this time either.

by IainGFoulds
Aug 31 2009
9:51 PM

... Fred: As we know, the Left is generally composed of do-nothing arm-chair economic dictators like Fitz.

... ARJ: How are things over at Liberal party headquarters? Recognising that your current leader is a dud, and in the absence of any constructive contribution, you only hope is obvious attempts to dislodge our nation's PM- the most respected leader in our country.

... BTW: Justin Trudeau is a good egg. I think he would make a great PM, and would probably win an easy majority.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
9:54 PM

The need to develop value-added processing in Canada, instead of continually shipping raw resources out of Canada: "There is nothing that workers in other countries do to Canadian resources that couldn't be done right here,"

Enjoy your plastic trinkets Fred z maybe you could suck the lead paint off, or melamine filler.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:01 PM

We can be just like the Americans and have a national debt owed to the Chinese, they wouldn't even have to invade, they will simply buy the country out for a song. It was taxpayers money that made the Tarsands, and it is taxpayer money that is forfeited to the Chinese at bargain basement prices.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:03 PM

As we all know the right wing is composed of greedy individual and cooperations sucking corporate welfare of the taxpayers tit.

by JEST
Aug 31 2009
10:05 PM

AJR79,Stephane Dion is a good egg.Ithink he would make a great leader of the rudderless Liberal party.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:06 PM

If the Chinese annoy us too much we'll tax the property back into our hands.

Ironically thats a leftist policy see Fidel Castro.

by EyeDubya
Aug 31 2009
10:07 PM

@ Fred Z

Bang on! Don't you just love it when the cultural relativists decry an action that would actually be in the interests of Canada because it might reflect positively on a Conservative government?

I just bet ol' Michelle Fitz would be the first to slag the PM if he were to declare trade restrictions on the Chicoms. You just can't win with some people.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:15 PM

Ian G foulds has no problem selling what rightly belongs to the taxpayers of Canada, to fatten the wallets of greedy corporations and business interests at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer. We will be subsidizing the Chinese, truly a lefty policy. Ian your true colors are showing.

by JEST
Aug 31 2009
10:15 PM

Wrong again Mike Fitz.It was the entrepreneurial spirit of American and Canadian oil men that made the oilsands.Any tax breaks by government were repaid ten fold a decade ago.

by Noozeaddict
Aug 31 2009
10:16 PM

The days where the USA and Ottawa are bullying us (Sask. Alberta) are slowly coming to an end. I do realize that we might be better off dealing with the

USA--and trust me if we had the choice we would. Obama and Ignatieff however went on the air to condemn the tarsands, as the USA and Eastern Canada were still using electricity generated from coal. We have a long record of selling wheat and other products to China. We'll make out OK!

Search

by IainGFoulds
Aug 31 2009
10:18 PM

... Micheal: Confused again.

... The true Right is not the role of the state "investing" working people's money. The true Right is the role of the state defending the right of working people to their earnings.

Wel

Abou

Edit

A no

welc

after

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:21 PM

Typical right wing zealots touting a deal with no parameters, just slight of hand. Maybe Ian or Eyedubya or Fred could enlighten us on what the "other financial interests" are. How can anyone claim this is good for us when no one knows what the deal is. Yea I will bet we really took those Chinese to the cleaners, look for large donations to the CPC from special interest groups as they (CPC) are so infamously known for.

by ZeeBC
Aug 31 2009
10:27 PM

Diane Francis had a great article on moving oil to the coast via rail cars. It was a win for everyone (except the Yanks) and negated the need for a pipeline to the coast.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:27 PM

The reason immigration increased under the last tory govt, was the sudden emergence of conservative insiders selling immigration tickets into the country and fast tracking applicants to fatten their own bank accounts in Switzerland. the tories could never be trusted with the public purse hence the perpetual minority govt. CPC the BIG LIE.

natio

FULL
CO

by RogersJi
Aug 31 2009
10:28 PM

Martin could have done a better job of research before writing his column, but I agree with most of it. A west-bound pipeline was just finished in 2008 so why would another be prohibitive for the private sector? Isn't Enbridge just now also ploughing in the Alberta Clipper?

Only a Liberal would recommend subsidizing a pipeline to the west coast so they could determine where it went and which Liberal companies got the contract. Enbridge and TransCanada should build two

appe

worn

claim

thous

Mean

and

diplo

systeme

the v

it at

Risse

pipeline from Alberta to Kitimat, one for oil and one to liquefy natural gas. I would hope that the federal government would not try to put too many road blocks in the way.

1985
we c

by ZeeBC
Aug 31 2009
10:29 PM

Someone take Don Martin's temperature to check if he is OK. A half decent effort for a change of pace or run out of Harper digs?

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:29 PM

Repaid by your accounts, not by mine. It is the entrepreneurial spirit of American and Canadian oil men that led to a trillion dollar plus a year national debt.

You
here
an [I](#)

by IainGFoulds
Aug 31 2009
10:32 PM

... It is a riot to observe ideologically adrift Liberals like Micheal twist themselves into absurd knots in attempting to address philosophical issues.



by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:32 PM

We have a long history of giving wheat to the Chinese as foreign aid. We have a short history of profiting from it, tell the same lie often enough and it will be believed noozeaddict.

by Jackal1234
Aug 31 2009
10:34 PM

i detect a bit of lefty panic at the thought that momentum has been turning, and good political decisions have been made, since the last poll putting the current gov't solidly in the lead

Full

by RogersJi
Aug 31 2009
10:35 PM

Micheal FitzPatrick: Like the gold and nickle in Ontario and Quebec belong to the provinces, the oil and other natural resources belongs to the provinces where they are found, Alberta and Sask in this case, not to your so-called 'taxpayers of Canada' (which I assume means you). The federal government taxes income on the resources and controls exports.

Chris

Chris

And I

Chris

our p

Chris

stimu

Chris

Chris

How about higher federal 'wind fall' taxes on gold in Val Dore, 50% when gold is over \$700/oz.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009
10:39 PM

The Avro Arrow about sums up the Conservative parties business acumen.

Chris

Chris

Or the air bus deal. At least the liberals sold out to Canadians and not foreign interests.

Chris

tuxed

Chris

by IainGFoulds

POPULAR
[Peter Foster: The man who doubted Al Gore Kelly McParland: NHL loses its white knight and might be stuck with Sir Jim of RIM Alberta to U.S.: Use the oil sands or lose them Kelly McParland:](#)

[Reality dawns in Liberal-land Conrad Black: Remembering Ted Kennedy, an unremarkable survivor David Frum on Ted Kennedy: Death of a big soul Raphael Alexander: Omar Khadr and the Lockerbie effect Don Martin: Are party loyalists the best Harper can come up with? Jeff Jedras: If Harper really wanted to reform the Senate, he would Charles Lewis: Ted Kennedy's second death](#)

E-MAIL
[Send a note to the editor](#)

Aug 31 2009 10:40 PM

... Micheal: Like any true Liberal, you add nothing constructive to any discussion- hot air and condemnation aside.

Subs

by Micheal FitzPatrick Aug 31 2009 10:41 PM

ian
The true Right is the role of the state defending the right of working people to their earnings.

Thats right and now we want our earnings from investing our tax dollars in the tarsands for Canadians and not foreign interests.

by Micheal FitzPatrick Aug 31 2009 10:42 PM

The only thing you got right Ian is Justin will be the next PM of a majority govt in Canada.

by symo88 Aug 31 2009 10:46 PM

Maybe environmentalists will give their head a shake too. Because most of them argue on giving the Chinese and Indians a break on emissions, so that they can take care of their poor huddled masses.

They argue for The West to develop technology, while they concentrate their new found wealth on liberating the poor.....yeah right

by IainGFoulds Aug 31 2009 10:48 PM

... Micheal: Given up on Ignatieff already?
... Hilarious.

by Micheal FitzPatrick Aug 31 2009 10:48 PM

Ian
Just when I thought you couldn't get your head any farther up your butt, you go and prove me wrong again.

by Micheal FitzPatrick Aug 31 2009 10:51 PM

Roger, you mean like the Offshore oil royalties Harper cheated NFL out of.

by AJR79 Aug 31 2009 10:52 PM

Iain: Perhaps I am not the same type of Conservative as you dimwit.

I respect Harpers accomplishments, but if you think he can grab majority, I think you're wrong

by Micheal FitzPatrick

Ian I have always maintained that Iggy is just a

Aug 31 2009 10:56 PM caretaker for the liberal party and Justin will be the next leader. [Full](#)

by AJR79
Aug 31 2009 10:58 PM and my leadership vote will be worth more then yours. (edmonton is it?) [Full](#)

Cheers [Full](#)

by Micheal FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009 11:00 PM After all the only light on the horizon for the conservatives is..... come to think of it, no one. Maybe Brians son will run. [New forei](#)

by Micheal FitzPatrick
Aug 31 2009 11:01 PM Obviously none of you clowns ever took a course in Physics, move the oil by rail, ha ha ha. [Polit](#)

by Roger181
Aug 31 2009 11:12 PM We already send nat gas by pipeline to the west coast, so I don`t think building a environmentally safe pipeline for oil should be impossible [Full](#)
[Poste](#)
[Our](#)
[Follo](#)

by ZeeBC
Aug 31 2009 11:19 PM Ignore the troll FitzNath. [Com](#)

by Roger181
Aug 31 2009 11:34 PM Micheal
If Justin T is the best the Liberals have to offer the Conservatives will be in power for a long long time. [Full](#)

by RogersJi
Aug 31 2009 11:48 PM Micheal FitzPatrick: Just trolling, not writing anything you believe to stir the pot are you. I pity you, you really need a life, try to get out more. Oh yes, don't kick the dog on the way out either. You never know, the dog might bite you back. [Full](#)

Headline in the Toronto Star: Micheal FitzPatrick bites his dog for biting him first, Iggy defends him by stating "an eye for an eye." [Get I](#)
[other](#)
[Blac](#)
[Viig](#)
[what](#)

by Micheal FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009 12:29 AM Harper sending his goons in the middle of the night to deport HKS in his pajamas just about sums up the Harper govt, a right wing dictatorship intent on looting the country and imposing rule by decree. Harper will never get a majority, he has just about broken every vow he made and is out of principals to compromise. His biggest mistake was getting greedy and trying to attain a majority govt by calling the last election, and wasting taxpayers money and time. Canadians have [Click](#)
[--S](#)

always preferred a liberal govt historically because they best represent the cross section of citizens in the country, and aren't as sleezy as the conservatives.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
12:37 AM

If all you right wing loonies spent less time drooling over the picture of Charleton Heston in a loin cloth plastered on the walls of your living rooms and took the time to understand the people of Canada you might have had a chance at majority govt. but you didn't so suck it up, the writings on the wall, back to cow town and shovel up the cow dung.

by JJJoseph
Sep 01 2009
12:40 AM

Roger181opined: "We already send nat gas by pipeline to the west coast, so I don't think building a environmentally safe pipeline for oil should be impossible"

I'm curious, Rog. What's an "environmentally safe pipeline"? Are these things spraying oil all over the landscape, or belching smoke? I've never actually seen any pipelines in my travels, so I'm curious what kind of environmental menace they actually are.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
1:03 AM

Joseph most pipelines are buried below ground which entails open cut trenching and road to access the trench by heavy equipment, along with pump houses stationed along the line and once again road access to the pump houses. Encroachment on natural habitat for wildlife and traditional hunting grounds of natives are the first to be impacted. While the federal govt may have mineral rights they don't have right of way over native lands for pipe laying and would have to expropriate by decree, further shortchanging the owners of the land.

by welldoneson
Sep 01 2009
1:16 AM

"Micheal" FitzPatrick:

Your comments litter this site like so much goose dump.

And you spell your own name wrong,

Michael.

by El Berta
Sep 01 2009
1:26 AM

It is in everyones best interests that Canada develop and expand markets. Since the money and power are shifting to the Orient, so should our trade focus. In addition to oil, we could export village idiots to those

wishing to understand western urban culture.

by Straightup
Sep 01 2009
1:27 AM

Green anything coming out of the US is BS! Threats about tariffs/taxes on fuel is a bargaining tool...that's it that's all...

It's utilized to guarantee cheap oil - PERIOD. In fact in the free trade agreement already guarantees THEIR supply OVER ours.

It's a ponzi scheme... Climate modeling can't predict what already happened with known data!!

by donjones
Sep 01 2009
1:28 AM

Micheal FitzPatrick = tiresome troll.

Could you add something useful to the conversation or please sod off. Maybe look into increasing your IQ by about 50 points before posting on NP forums or stick to the G&M.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
1:32 AM

seeing as it is my name i will spell it however i please, who are you the name police,

by Percy78
Sep 01 2009
5:26 AM

While I agree with much of what is being said here in this article, I am laughing my head off at those posters who a very short while ago were supporting Harper's misguided policy towards China. Those same posters were jumping all over those who disagreed with them and the PM. But now, boldly and without embarassment, they come on here flip-flopping like flat fish.

A degree of consistency and independent thinking goes a long way to building respect for one's opinion.

by marq65
Sep 01 2009
5:46 AM

Like a glutton with disregard for weight gain; PetroChinas new slogan: 'screw your environment, we want oil!'. A parallel line between dirty oil & conflict diamonds is starting to materialize. When rational people are given another option, they make responsible choices; desperate people elevate everyones blood pressure when their mainline's being cut. Refined provenance makes even the most self-centered consumer content so, why are Western democracies drug resistant to the prescriptions being offered to under developed countries?

When the federal or provincial government ... surprise,

surprise, they're both Conservative ... forget the personal income taxpayer & moonlight as agents for big business, you have to question why you're supporting billion dollar companies who dig deep into your pockets to keep their profits & their oil flowing in one direction. Any wonder their profit margins are so high when their expenses are partially paid with your taxable income? Elected governments govern the people; an elected board of governors govern corporations ... or has the line been permanently erased in favour of corporate welfare?

by Tossed Salad
Sep 01 2009
7:46 AM

Micheal FitzPatrick:

The reason immigration increased under the last tory govt, was the sudden emergence of conservative insiders selling immigration tickets into the country and fast tracking applicants to fatten their own bank accounts in Switzerland.

Dude your losing it. You go from some semblance of a reasoned argument to a frothing at the mouth troll who is one step away from a padded cell. Take a look at all your comments in this thread in chronological order and watch your descent into madness. You could truly be used as a case study. Amazing.

by Tim Cares
Sep 01 2009
8:02 AM

It is ridiculous to let the Chinese get controlling interest in our oil industry.

We need to worry about who we are selling to.

It is one thing to sell them the oil after it is extracted.

It is another thing to let them control the extraction and decide where it goes.

by IainGFoulds
Sep 01 2009
8:41 AM

... Were it up to the Left, all investments in our nation would be made by our trusted politicians and bureaucrats, motivated only by a love for the people, and not filthy profits.

... "Oh no, we don't want communism", they protest.

... Yes, you do.

by marpincan
Sep 01 2009
8:53 AM

My understanding is that shipping to the west coast is not a big deal. CN has already done a study and would have no problem shipping in tank cars via rail and lots

of rail capacity available.

This is a good move for Canada as it makes sense to have diversified markets rather than relying on our southern neighbors refineries and political whim.

by edd333ed
Sep 01 2009
8:55 AM

Michael

Crude oil can be, and has been, moved by tankcar; so can refined product. IMHO, those along projected pipeline routes and other linear takings are more interested in extracting a rent (either in perpetuity or by capitalizing its value and selling the route) than in the largely hypothetical environmental consequences you vapourize over. This includes aboriginal groups, and I speak from experience.

I know it's hard for a Liberal troll, but have you considered getting a life as opposed to writing on subjects you clearly know nothing about.

by Sunnyflower
Sep 01 2009
9:55 AM

Micheal "We can be just like the Americans and have a national debt owed to the Chinese, they wouldn't even have to invade, they will simply buy the country out for a song. It was taxpayers money that made the Tarsands, and it is taxpayer money that is forfeited to the Chinese at bargain basement prices."

How, pray tell, will we end up owing a debt to the Chinese when it is their money flowing into our country? HmMMM? The exact opposite position of that of the US, no?

Bargain basement prices? Says who? You?
Compared to what? Not selling it at all?

I don't understand why you have a problem with us expanding our market. More buyers = better prices.

Do you have something against the Chinese? Is there another country that you would deem more suitable?
If so, perhaps you would like to set up a trade mission with them and get the ball rolling?

by Anonymous66
Sep 01 2009
10:06 AM

by JETSOLVER - "we would much rather sell to even the morally lacking Chinese than you and yours...which should tell you something about us, and about you."

Whenever someone says that they'd rather sell to

anything but the highest bidder, what that tells me is that they're an idiot.

by Allen Stevens

Sep 01 2009
10:13 AM

To gwestbound

Aug 31 2009

7:56 PM

You Wrote:

"I am so tired of the U.S. jerking us around. Let's get started on a west coast pipeline tomorrow."

Rather than using a pipeline as a method for revenge. Let us base the construction of a pipeline West on sound business practices.

So...when do we start!?

by Digger Don

Sep 01 2009
10:15 AM

What happened to the concerns about big clean oil tankers splitting apart, killing millions of birds and other creatures?

This would not happen with the so called dirty oil from Alberta sent to the US.

by Sassylassie

Sep 01 2009
10:25 AM

We could sell the rail lines to the Chinese.

End quote:-----

Why not, it was the Chinese who died uniting Canada's east and west by laying said rail lines.

by Anonymous66

Sep 01 2009
10:25 AM

re: IainFGoulds - Of course, selling a controlling stake TO the world's biggest communist country is scarcely less communist than made-in-canada ownership regulations.

And re: edd333ed ... I have to think that building a refinery and shipping the refined product by rail is a better economic prospect than shipping the crude to Vancouver by train, and then tankering that to overseas refineries. Surely the savings from shipping a much smaller volume would offset the capital outlay for the refinery sooner or later ... and that way, the refining profits stay here.

by obamination

Sep 01 2009

As for the Americans and their abhorrence of our dirty

11:20 AM oil:

To quote a much-loved (by Ontarians in particular) politician of old, "Let the bastards freeze in the dark".

by Marvs
Sep 01 2009
11:40 AM

Whatever China needs that a country or company can sell will flourish.

Any country or company that will sell what China can sell as well will go bankrupt.

One only needs to travel to China and Asia to know how influential and economically powerful these emerging economies really are. The old poor and backward mental picture we have at this region should be discarded. A new power-shift from west to east had started before our very eyes.

by JETSOLVER
Sep 01 2009
11:46 AM

Anon 66;

"Whenever someone says that they'd rather sell to anything but the highest bidder, what that tells me is that they're an idiot."/////

No, the reality is that is that if you retain a 40% stake in the operation, and are expected to run it, you choose the best bidder for your long term prospects. Business 101

As you are obviously destined to run the counter on the 8-10:30 pm shift, here is another bit of solid business advice...

Close your mouth. It makes you look smarter.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
11:58 AM

Cap and trade, carbon credits, for what China has saved in cap and trade from turning coal into fuel they have invested in tarsands, and Canada will be paying the carbon credits on the processing, smart cookies these Chinese. The Americans know a bad deal when they see one, read the deal, "other financial interests" Canadians are being suckered, moving the pollution to Alta from China.

by JCharper
Sep 01 2009
12:27 PM

The idea of using rail to transport oil leads me to thinking about the 25-50 ft of land CN already holds ownership of or at least control of, on each side of the tracks, right through BC to the coast.

Has anyone thought to approach CN for right away

access for a pipe line to Rupert? Seems to me an easy way to address native issues, environmental issues, survey and land access costs, etc.

Joint venturing with CN ought to make the crossing far simpler and cost effective.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
12:29 PM

The cost of moving oil through a pipeline is 10% of the cost of the barrel

Currently, pipelines charge \$17.95 per barrel to ship oil from Alberta to the U. S

To move oil by rail would require ten times the fuel used to move it by pipeline resulting in co2 emmissions taxable under cap and trade.

The price of a barrel of oil is dropping shipping costs are increasing.

The only cost effective way to move oil by rail is to upgrade to electrical power which would far outweigh any cost savings short term for the upgrade.

by Digger Don
Sep 01 2009
2:17 PM

Obama says Canada has "dirty oil" but the US had "clean coal".

Clean Coal is a greatest advertising gimmick since Joe Camel.

Obama is promoting domestic industries. Our leaders need to do the same kind of advertising of our resources. Where is Ralph Klein?

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
2:40 PM

The Canadian oil sands is the world's largest, and dirtiest, energy project.

by Digger Don
Sep 01 2009
3:22 PM

Micheal

Thanks for keeping your most recent post to one sentence.

by GuyTron
Sep 01 2009
4:31 PM

Troll Alert - Do not respond to Micheal FitzPatrick anymore. He is a Liberal Partisan shill and has not intent on rational debate. Just ignore him.

by GuyTron
Sep 01 2009

Hey Don, great article. I think this is the second time I

4:34 PM

can remember you writing an article based on fact. It would have been nice if you would have also mentioned that even though Obama calls it Dirty Oil, it only requires 10% more energy to extract and refine than regular crude oil. Thank you for another good article.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
4:40 PM

guytron is a conservative partisan skill.

by GuyTron
Sep 01 2009
4:45 PM

welldoneson - Oh No I just realized something. Michael FitzPatrick seems to have become more industrious since we stopped responding to goose##. I think he changed names. What a clever duck, er should I say silly Goose. If we ignore him maybe he will go away too.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
4:46 PM

The federal government is spending \$1.5 billion in tar sand oil subsidies over a five-year period from 2007 to 2011, or \$300 million a year.

The tar sands subsidy is part of a tax break called the accelerated capital cost allowance that is to be phased out by 2015. It lets tar sand operators defer taxes until all their capital costs have been paid off.

“Initially it looks like a good news announcement that this preferential treatment of tar sand industry will gradually be phased out, but it’s really just relief for billionaires,

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
4:48 PM

brown noser alert, guytron is a suckholing weasel.

by Micheal
FitzPatrick
Sep 01 2009
4:57 PM

If the tar sands were located in China we would be ragging on them and beating them with a big stick, for polluting the enviroment.

Services: [Privacy](#) | [Terms](#) |
[Contact us](#) | [Advertise with us](#) |
[FAQ](#) | [Copyright and permissions](#)
| [Today's paper](#) | [Digital paper](#) |
[Newsletters](#) | [News Feeds](#) |
[Subscription services](#) | [Site map](#)

National Post: [Home](#) | [News](#) | [Opinion](#) | [Arts](#) | [Life](#) | [Sports](#) | [Cars](#) | [Multimedia](#) | [Blogs](#) | [Classifieds](#)

Financial Post: [Home](#) | [News](#) | [Opinion](#) | [Trading Desk](#) | [Markets](#) | [Money](#) | [Small Business](#) | [Executive](#) | [Careers](#) | [Reports](#) | [FP Magazine](#)

National Post and **Financial Post** are Part of the Canada.com Network

↕

© 2009 The National Post Company. All rights reserved. Unauthorized distribution, transmission or republication strictly prohibited.