

Fiscal Transfers to Provinces

it actually costs money to produce oil today. For every barrel of conventional oil produced in that province today, the combination of federal and provincial taxes means it costs money. One actually has to pay 75 cents to produce a barrel of oil. The hon. member for Kitchener says it is all the province's fault. But what kind of a system is that?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not comment on what the hon. member was saying. I hope he will make that clarification in his speech.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, any member who wants to speak on this bill is welcome to join us.

This question of geological roulette is not quite the whole answer. It is not exclusively a question of geology. It has much to do with questions such as royalties, taxes, price and many other things.

Mr. Evans: Royalties, taxes and price will not put oil there.

Mr. Andre: I grant you, you are not going to be able to find oil if there is no sedimentary rock underneath. But what it involves is an awful lot more than just running outside and poking a hole in the ground.

Mr. Rae: I did not say that.

Mr. Andre: I am not suggesting the hon. member said that, but the term "geological roulette" implies it. His exact words were: "It had a lot to do with luck". It is not just luck. It is what was done with the opportunity which was available to those provinces.

I have one other comment on the question of revenues and the necessity of developing new equalization schemes. It concerns the question of approaching this from an honest point of view. There is no hope of us reaching an accord in this country as long as the government and members opposite keep talking about needing a more equitable share—that it is unfair for the federal government to get only 10 per cent and the provinces 45 per cent. That figure is just a blatant lie.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre: The more often that statement is repeated as the truth, the deeper the resentment, the deeper the resistance, the more alienation—call it what you like—will occur. We have to approach this thing from an honest point of view. We must be honest.

Mr. Lang: When are you going to start?

Mr. Andre: The member who rose on his fallacious point of order asks us when are we going to start.

I would advise the hon. member to read the bible—the *Sunday Star*. By reading George Bain's column, the hon. member will note a few of the inaccuracies in "The National Energy Program". I suggest the best way to start would be for members opposite to challenge the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) in caucus by telling them that these

facts are being denied by people out west, and with some legitimacy.

An hon. Member: Even the Ontario papers are doing that.

Mr. Andre: Hon. members should ask whether there is some basis for that. That is the way to start. As long as hon. members keep repeating in mailings, in speeches, etc., the demonstrably false information contained in "The National Energy Program" and given to hon. members by the minister and his officials, the more difficult it will be for this country to come together and resolve some very difficult problems. I say this in all sincerity. It is necessary to demand more integrity from that minister. It is a situation which is extremely important to the long-term future of this country. It cannot be understated.

● (2120)

Before closing, I would like to say to the minister that we are prepared to see clauses 1 and 2 of Bill C-24, dealing with equalization, receive very rapid passage. We support the view of the NDP that the subject matter of equalization is worthy of considerable discussion and a reference to that effect should be given to the finance committee. That might be a better way of doing it than using this bill exclusively as a means of addressing ourselves to those questions.

With regard to clause 3 dealing with PUITTA on the basis of equity and reasonableness, it is absolutely fundamental that the federal tax system be fair in its application to all Canadians, no matter where they live. This proposal is patently unfair and we will resist it. Therefore, we make no commitment to rapid passage of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity during the discussion of Bill C-24 having to do with federal-provincial fiscal arrangements and transfer payments to make a few remarks about how this topic bears on the subject of health care, for which I am responsible in the NDP caucus.

However, one never debates in isolation, and before the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) leaves the chamber, I would like to respond to part of what he said. I begin by assuring him that as a fellow western Canadian and a member of a party which stands, to put it mildly, in critical relationship with many of the ideas he espouses from time to time, we do not think that the streets of Alberta are paved with gold or that somewhere in Alberta there is a large vault which Albertans are greedily hoarding and protecting from other Canadians in an inappropriate way. We understand, as do all Canadians, that the anxiety of Albertans about a non-renewable resource is legitimate and has to be taken very seriously.

Having stated that I know the streets in Alberta are not paved with gold, the hon. member and I part company for philosophical reasons. I have talked to many Manitobans who have gone to Alberta to take part in what is perceived to be a great surfeit of riches and have come home broke, partly because the great wealth being created in Alberta is not being