

our eyes. Albertans are seeing their future heritage and hope being taken from their control. A federal government stomping on Alberta will feed on its own power, and other provinces will also feel its tentacles. That is what this struggle is about; that is what the fight is going to be about, and that is why I feel, along with Mr. Getty, that Alberta must stand and fight for its heritage and its future, and the future of our children.

Premier Lougheed's call is not just to Albertans or even just to western Canadians, it is to thinking Canadians everywhere. But whether they rally to Alberta's side or not, unless there is a change in federal actions and policies the result is a resistance that Alberta intends to maintain. It is a resistance that the province of Alberta can carry on in another way. It is a resistance that members of parliament from Alberta feel committed to, for the good of all Canada. I submit it is a resistance by members of parliament on this side of the House from all provinces, who are concerned that the future development of this country and the future national unity of this country depend upon a square deal for the development of regional resources. I submit that Mr. Getty has made very serious public charges against the federal government, and I think the minister ought to respond.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): At the outset of his remarks, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman said that perhaps when his colleagues address themselves to these questions they talk with a violence that causes them to have a narrow viewpoint, and he said that he would not emulate them. I would have to say that he has followed through. Indeed, in the two years that we have mutually sat in the House at the same time this has been characteristic of his approach, and perhaps uncharacteristic of his colleagues.

I think the hon. member's was a thoughtful approach, but I wonder if he cannot see in the speech made by Mr. Getty some of the basic contradictions he put to himself. In particular, the hon. member started off by saying that he felt Alberta had been victimized by central Canada, just as Mr. Getty did in his speech, through uncharacteristically, I would agree, and dripping with venom he expressed such a terrible antipathy to central Canada. Both gentlemen used the expression "victimized by central Canada," in regard to Alberta.

I remarked earlier today that there had been programs operating in both directions, both in favour of Alberta and in favour of the consuming provinces. Indeed, programs have been operating for the Atlantic provinces and right across Canada to deal with their different circumstances. But "victimized by central Canada"—is that correct?

To deal with Mr. Getty's second point, when he says that, "You can't sell oil to Canadians at world prices", I would point out that there has not been a tradition of selling oil to Canadians at world prices. For ten or 15 years oil was sold to central Canada at about \$1.25 or \$1.50 above world prices.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Andre: That is not true.

Oil and Petroleum

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is true. It certainly is true. I pay no attention to the hon. member for Calgary Centre, but address myself to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona because he has taken an intelligent approach. The Alberta industry developed on the basis of a series of federal policies, not central Canada policies, but federal policies which substantially assisted the development of that industry and from which at that particular time the producers of Alberta benefited.

That was due to the fact that Ontario in particular, instead of taking the offshore oil which could have been landed more cheaply into the Toronto and Sarnia refineries, developed industry on the basis of western Canada oil. There was no question of victimizing anybody. It was a good policy, and it assisted the development of the Alberta industry.

I have difficulty when I address myself to a member like the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona in finding how he can speak with antipathy about a part of the country which I happen to represent, and in which I know he was educated. The hon. member for Crowfoot is an Albertan and he has a particular viewpoint, but may I suggest that bringing out this particular attitude—

Mr. Horner: Why bring me into it?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —is not going to assist us at all. When the hon. member talks about a particular part of the country being victimized, and Premier Lougheed talks in such vicious terms as he did in September, 1973, about central and eastern Canada, then I would suggest to the hon. member that he might reflect and think about the attitude behind that point of view.

Let me deal with the questions one by one. On the question of world prices I have pointed out that Alberta has not been getting world prices in the past but has been getting better than world prices. Indeed, in relation to natural gas which was a system put into effect through federal policies, gas which would have had to be flared at the wellhead was marketed to the advantage of both those who were consuming it and those who were producing it. Federal policies were in force to achieve this. It was not victimization. It is very much the reason why there are skyscrapers today in Calgary and Edmonton—because there were national policies which gave advantages to that particular industry.

Mr. Yewchuk: The victimization is not by central Canada, it is you.

● (2020)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is not what the hon. member said and it is not what Mr. Getty said. If the hon. member for Athabasca means his remark in a personal way, that is all right; I do not care.

Mr. Andre: The minister sounds like Portugal rationalizing the colonies.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Getty taking exception to the petroleum administration bill. It is not clear in his speech whether he takes exception to the fact that there is a single oil price in Canada, and that we are using part of the economic rent