

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Not even Pinard will believe that.

**Mr. Andre:** And the Americans have \$4 billion of our money.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, the facts and the figures are easy to establish. One just has to take the Crosbie budget, look at the increase—

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Order!

**Mr. Trudeau:**—look at the specified price set in that budget, being 85 per cent of world prices, and then the hon. member would find out how we have saved that money of the consumers thus far.

In so far as the instructions given to the minister are concerned, they are quite simple. It is to seek a compromise solution with the government of Alberta. The need for increased prices has been recognized in our own national energy policy; it is still being recognized. It was indicated by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in his meeting last month with his Alberta counterpart that we would be recognizing the need for higher energy prices. The big discussion, no doubt, will be on the share of those prices which remains in Alberta and that share which is redistributed through the federal government to Canadian consumers, the taxpayers.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Which one, Pierre?

**Mr. Wilson:** Madam Speaker, the Crosbie budget is not the point. I am talking about what happened after the Crosbie budget, with the Alberta proposal of July, 1980, compared with what has happened since then. The government is a party of high gasoline prices, and it is a party of broken promises.

**Some hon. Members:** Order, order!

**Mr. Wilson:** It is a party of high prices, which have been gobbled up by the federal government through increased taxes, and high prices which have done nothing to keep drilling rigs in the country and to encourage energy development.

**Some hon. Members:** Question!

## SHARING OF TAX REVENUES

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is specifically related to this compromise. Is the government prepared to share some of these exorbitant taxes with the producing provinces and the industry, or is it proposing to layer the inevitable price increases which will come from these negotiations on top of the high taxes we have already seen?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, once again the hon. member seems to misunderstand the essential difference between the policy of his party and our policy. The essential difference is not on the need for higher

prices. We recognize that; we recognized that during the election.

**Mr. Clark:** Except in Allan's ads.

**Mr. Trudeau:** We are just ensuring that these higher prices will still be lower over the four-year period than those proposed by the party opposite.

But the essential difference, once again, is not on prices. It is on how the money flowing from that resource will be shared among Canadians. That is the essential difference. Essentially that is the reason why Premier Lougheed's proposal of last summer was not acceptable to the government, and is not acceptable today. It still resulted in Alberta receiving about 45 per cent of the returns from the petroleum industry—

**Mr. Andre:** Nonsense!

● (1420)

**Mr. Trudeau:**—the private sector getting about 45 per cent—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:**—and the federal government getting about 10 per cent. This is not acceptable to a government whose duty it is to ensure equality of opportunity across the country.

**Mr. Wilson:** Madam Speaker, the point is that we must share. Some 72 per cent has been shared by the federal government since the beginning of 1980. The balance has gone to the others. I am asking whether there will be some better distribution of those funds than has been the case so far to date.

## EXCISE TAX ON NATURAL GAS

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question relates to what happened last night. Alberta and British Columbia have consistently opposed the excise tax on natural gas. The legality of this particular tax is yet to be decided by the Supreme Court of Canada. Last month the Appeal Court of Alberta ruled that this tax was invalid, illegal. Since Alberta has specifically requested that this legislation relating to that tax be deferred until after the negotiations, and until after the Supreme Court decision, how can the Prime Minister justify invoking closure on this particular piece of legislation on the very day that the negotiations with Alberta were to start?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member began his question by pointing out figures which are quite fanciful. But, assuming that they were true and that 75 per cent went to the federal government—

**Mr. Wilson:** Seventy-two per cent.

**Mr. Trudeau:**—72 per cent went to the federal government, he asked if there could be a better share. I can assure the hon.