

out of the hon. member for York-Simcoe who just came out with a ringing appeal for higher prices for the consumers of Ontario. We will make certain that his view, that Ontario people should pay higher prices for gas and oil, is well known to his constituents and to other citizens of the province. This is a critical question and it is one on which the hon. member has just hooked himself. As I said to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, the question is whether Canadians should be paying adequate prices to bring about additional resources in Canada, but not world prices, or whether we should go to world prices. The hon. member for York-Simcoe has just hooked himself with the highest price and "sock it to the consumer."

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is obvious to those in the chamber that the minister has absolutely no justification for making a statement like that. The record will show that at no time did I suggest higher oil prices. The minister did not deal with the important point, that is, why we are experiencing a shortfall in Ontario if there is a shortfall.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member specifically adopted the United States program of higher oil prices for Americans.

Mr. Stanfield: So have you.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, I have not.

Mr. Stanfield: You are a demagogue.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Chairman, whenever a member from Alberta stands in this chamber to speak on energy, there seems to be the automatic assumption on the other side that he is going to present a narrow focus. I hope the minister will listen for the next few minutes as I attempt to put the bill before us in the wider context which it deserves. I declare with pride, as I stand here as an Albertan, that I am a Canadian first. In presenting an argument in respect of provincial rights to the minister, I think I do more to contribute to national unity than does this type of bill which steamrollers over legitimate provincial interests.

By way of introduction to my remarks, let me say that last Saturday a number of Liberal cabinet ministers went to Edmonton to attend a fund-raising dinner. That was their right. But I think it was not their right to make statements such as the one made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, that Alberta members of parliament come down here as demagogues. I reject that statement. What a suggestion, that we cannot stand here as Alberta members of parliament presenting arguments in the best interest of our country! I would ask the minister to give us his view, at the conclusion of my remarks, on whether my remarks about this bill can be taken as demonstrating a demagogic position.

If we do not lie down and allow this Liberal government to steamroller over us, and if we resist with some strength a bill which we believe will do irreparable harm to our country, we are accused of filibustering. It is not my belief that the people of Canada represented here by members of this party, people who have asked us to speak for them here, expect us to lie down. That is why you will hear

Oil and Petroleum

during this debate not only from members from Alberta but members from Quebec, Nova Scotia and the other provinces. What is at stake here is the legitimate regional and provincial development of our country. I laugh when I hear speeches about Alberta and its strong energy position and the suggestion that it is adopting a separatism position, going its own way. Nothing could be further from the truth. Far from trying to get out of Canada, members from Alberta for years have spent their time here fighting to get into Canada. We have been trying to assert ourselves as real partners. This is what the Western Economic Opportunities Conference was all about. That was the conference which promised us our so-called place in the sun, in legitimate recognition of the fact that we have been victimized by central Canada. That is the conference which is long overdue in accomplishing what it set out to do.

Since this is the first time I have spoken on this bill, I intend to address some questions to the minister. Before doing so, however, I should like to deal with what this bill will accomplish in general, in an effort to show that as an Albertan I am concerned about the total effect of the bill from the constitutional and energy supply aspects. Why is the total issue involving the constitution and supply important to all Canadians and not just to Albertans or westerners? This debate clearly centres on issues of broad national significance. We are discussing whether or not the federal government is constitutionally intruding into an area of provincial jurisdiction. We are discussing the extent to which a province has the right to manage its resources as it sees fit. That is the basic issue.

● (1650)

In this analysis, the vehicles for discussion are crude oil and natural gas, but the issue clearly extends throughout the entire spectrum of non-renewable resources. We are discussing a provincial revenue which may, to a greater or lesser extent, be subject to equalization, which is certainly an issue of more than passing interest to the other provinces of this country. And we are concerned about the condition of an industry whose future success bears directly on the future economic well-being of this nation. Certainly this is not an unimpressive list of national concerns. But even more fundamental is the fact that in this debate we should be concerned about the extent to which the Government of Canada is inclined to penetrate the domain of private and public interests in its effort to achieve what it perceives as social justice. I believe it is fair to say that the traditional purpose of the law has been to assure the legitimate expectations of individuals living in a free yet ordered society. Only if organizations and individuals are free to order their lives and their affairs with reasonable expectations that today's rules will apply in the future, when their present actions may be judged, can there exist tranquility in the person and peace in his society.

When normal expectations are frustrated, society grows fearful and distrustful and is more prone to lapse into disorder. To what extent can what we might term the natural laws of economics and of human conduct be controlled and even repealed by parliament? To what extent can we comprehensively and logically prepare for tomorrow's oil supply difficulties, in light of today's frenetic political climate? It is difficult to perceive how we will