

Will the Prime Minister also confirm that these oil prices, which will cost Canadian consumers some \$14 billion, will be shared under the existing oil pricing formula, thereby giving the multinational oil companies—which already have record profit increases—an extra \$7 billion? How does the Prime Minister reconcile that kind of rip-off to Canadians, who in 1983 will be paying an extra \$700 a year just to heat their homes and drive their cars?

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will want to review *Hansard* to determine whether or not he intended to say he did not believe that I was reflecting the situation exactly as it stands, and perhaps change his statement later in the day or tomorrow.

To come to the question and not its tone, one of the matters that we are looking at, as we prepare an energy package, is a means by which we can establish procedures and mechanisms which will encourage a substantial increase in investment by Canadians in Canada's energy potential so that we can accomplish two goals together: the first goal would be to substantially improve the supply situation in Canada, thus protecting us against uncertainty in the future; and the second goal would be to substantially increase the degree of Canadian participation in and ownership of the energy industry.

**Mr. Symes:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the Prime Minister, if he were to table the documents which I have cited, we could take a look at the situation for ourselves. By way of a final supplementary, will the Prime Minister acknowledge that in a document entitled "Memorandum of Understanding: Alberta's Contribution to a National Energy Strategy", Alberta will agree to lend money from its Heritage Fund at commercial rates for future energy development, and that, in effect, Edmonton—not Ottawa—now becomes the capital of Canada as far as national energy planning is concerned? How does he reconcile this abdication of federal responsibility with the national interest?

**Mr. Clark:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is looking for a document which outlines the removal, in practice or in principle, of the capital of Canada, then no such document exists. There have been active discussions with some of the provinces, including the governments of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, which have put forth a number of options which might be the basis of agreement between the federal and provincial governments. None of those options have yet been decided upon, and none of them will be decided upon until there has been an opportunity for further discussion involving all the provinces and all the governments concerned.

I can assure the hon. member that the ultimate decision will be very much in the national interests of Canada and will have regard for the fundamental importance in this country of taking steps today which will guarantee against Canada being

exposed to uncertain supplies of energy offshore that we need for this nation to grow.

\* \* \*

[Translations]

## FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

### INQUIRY WHETHER GOVERNMENT WILL PREPARE PAPER ON PROPOSALS RESPECTING RENEWED FEDERALISM

**Mr. Fabien Roy (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the right hon. Prime Minister. Last Friday, following the release of the Quebec white paper, opposition members asked questions of the Prime Minister, who answered:

These proposals show that since the last election on May 22 the federal government in our country is not prisoner of the status quo, that it is determined to set out various approaches to the issue of federalism in Canada, and that it can, in co-operation with all provinces which it considers as partners and certainly not as enemies, demonstrate the possibility of a renewed federalism.

Since reference is made to a renewed federalism, it is then obvious that changes are being considered. If changes are considered there will be a need for negotiations. Today, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he can indicate to the House what are the areas or fields of jurisdiction that his government is prepared to discuss with the provinces, and I would also like to ask him if a document has been, or is being, drafted; and, if so, whether that document could be tabled before the end of the year.

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, there have been several discussions in particular between the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations and his provincial counterparts concerning specific changes in the constitution or in the arrangements between the different levels of government. There is no plan as such for changing our constitution. There is no grand design for a constitutional reform but conversations have been held and I hope there will be others during the next federal-provincial conference in December.

### INQUIRY WHETHER GOVERNMENT READY TO RETURN CERTAIN TAX FIELDS TO QUEBEC

**Mr. Fabien Roy (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Since the issues raised at the constitutional conferences were only minor ones, and since there is nonetheless a problem which has been pending for many years and has been the subject of many representations, especially from the Quebec government and from many premiers, I would like to ask the government if, in its present openmindedness, it would be ready to return to Quebec all the taxation