

Adjournment Debate

we were prepared to raise the price of oil in stages by \$4 a barrel in 1980 and by \$4.50 a year thereafter, subject to further adjustment after 1982 if necessary. In short, we were contemplating a lower price increase than is this government. We were truthful, they were deceitful. That is only part of the utter deceit this government exhibits and the utter contempt in which it holds the Canadian public. We find the real thing that government craved after as far as energy was concerned was revenue.

We have the startling fact revealed that in 1980 the total take from energy revenue sources was \$2.3 billion. By 1983 this government anticipates that the revenue will jump by \$6.7 billion to \$9 billion. How would you feel if you were a member of the industry and saw a revenue increase during the same time-frame of only \$2.1 billion, especially if you were a resident of the province of Alberta, while at the same time you saw a revenue increase on the part of this government of \$3.4 billion, or if you take the three western producing provinces, a revenue increase of \$4.5 billion?

In short, that minister misled this House when he said in answer to my question on June 4 that his top priority was one of negotiation with the hope of reaching an agreement. He misled this House by knowing at that time he intended to bring in a proposal which would gouge the people of the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, and the industry itself. In short, I would suggest that is why we have no agreement in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There are certain terms that are parliamentary and the hon. member is coming very close to an unparliamentary term. If he said "misled", I think he would have to stop at that, but the suggestion that there was a knowing misleading of the House, by the traditions of the House, is unparliamentary. I invite the hon. member to rephrase his remarks.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I am not clear in what respect you feel I have said something that is unparliamentary.

● (2225)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the tradition of the House is that it is a breach and an unparliamentary expression to say that another hon. member has knowingly misled the House. If the hon. member confines his remarks simply to saying that the House has been misled, that is acceptable.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I think if you and the officer at the Table check the record, you will find that I did not say, as Your Honour has indicated, that he knowingly misled the House. I simply stated he misled the House, that it was deceitful and that he was gouging the people of those three fine provinces. In short, I was indicating that what has been revealed, mainly in the budget and the so-called national energy policy, since our question of June 4, has brought out very clearly the utter deceit and contempt in which this government holds the Canadian public with respect to this question of energy pricing and with respect to this government's handling of the entire energy issue in this country.

In short, we have an 18 cents-plus per gallon increase in the price of gasoline. Hon. members opposite did that by deceit; they will pay the penalty.

Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose engaging in similar intemperate remarks to those of the previous speaker—

Mr. Stevens: They are true, though.

Mr. MacLaren:—would advance our understanding of the pricing policies of this government, so perhaps I should take a moment and attempt to explain to the hon. member the basis of that policy.

It is evident from the hon. member's remarks that he does not understand the National Energy Program, which sets out the wellhead pricing schedule we intend to implement. Starting from a price of \$16.75 for conventional oil in mid-1980, the price is to rise by one dollar increments every six months until mid-1983 when the increases will be accelerated, so that by 1990 the price of conventional oil will have reached \$63.25 per barrel. The oil sands reference price will start at the international price level and move ahead at a considerably higher rate. Intermediate, between those two pricing schedules, will be a third pricing schedule to encourage tertiary recovery of oil.

The pricing elements then become the basis for establishing the blended price for all consumers, to which reference has been made in the Speech from the Throne and elaborated upon in the national energy policy.

The government stands ready to negotiate with Alberta the implementation of this pricing system. In preparation for that negotiation, officials of the two governments have been holding a number of meetings to clarify differences in data interpretation and to make recommendations to ministers regarding the issues to be settled at the ministerial level in the price negotiation.

I must emphasize that the federal government is eager to settle these pricing matters in the interests of all Canadians. At the moment, however, we are still awaiting an indication from the Alberta government as to its readiness to proceed.

The issue of oil prices cannot be separated from the issue of revenue sharing. The National Energy Program will ensure that the Alberta government has revenues far in excess of its expenditures for decades to come, while at the same time providing for a fair and equitable sharing of costs and benefits by all Canadians.

As we enter this all-important negotiation, we shall make it quite clear that nothing the federal government has said or done is meant to challenge the oil-producing provinces' indisputable ownership of their resources. Under these conditions there is no reason why a satisfactory resolution of the pricing issue should not be expeditiously reached in a manner which will best serve the interests of all regions of Canada.