

the province of Alberta, by now we would have had an agreement. No one can continue to attack in that abrasive and arrogant fashion and expect to get a deal. That is the problem. I must say we are getting rather disgusted by this minister's actions and by his attitude.

We know that the minister of energy did not want to get a deal. The minister visited Edmonton twice in the spring of 1980. He spent about 100 minutes attempting to seek a deal. In reality he was barely crawling through the hoops. He has failed to take advantage of a fundamental political opportunity. I would say that he has created a political error of historic dimension. I would accuse him of an action which could only be classified as premeditated abdication of his duty.

In order to be an effective energy minister, one must have not only the knowledge and the political skill, but the trust and confidence. And above all, he must be seen as fair and reasonable. Unless this minister is prepared to change his ways and demonstrate some of these attributes, I suggest we will be a long time in getting an energy agreement.

Further, the minister of energy should stop misleading the people of Canada. He should stop accusing Alberta of being a filthy rich and selfish province. I think the evidence now clearly reveals that based upon a gallon of gasoline sold in the province of Ontario, the province of Ontario is receiving more in terms of revenue than is the province of Alberta. To be exact, out of a charge of \$1.66 a gallon, the government of Ontario receives 25 cents or 15 per cent of the total proceeds, whereas the government of Alberta in its royalties receives 22.7 cents or 14 per cent of the total. The federal government receives 56 cents, which is about 34 per cent of the total, with the balance going to the producer, the refiner and the dealer.

I suggest it is time for the minister of energy to level with the people and lay out the facts so that everyone can understand who is the bad guy in the negotiations. If he can change his attitude, level with the Canadian people and try to establish an environment and a climate of trust and confidence, we can move ahead. We must move ahead in order to achieve our economic—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp).

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion, I must say that my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Crosbie) has put before the House in a very succinct manner two views as to how we believe Canada should develop its resources.

The government in its bill sees the development of Canada generally through the eyes of a centralized bureaucracy only. While I say that is not totally invalid because we need that component, it is not the only component making up Canada. The other component consists of our regions. I will come to that, but first I want to thank the hon. member for St. John's East in putting forward the two views of Canada so clearly.

W. A. Wilson, a member of the press gallery, a journalist respected by members on both sides of the House, makes the

Canada Oil and Gas Act

point in an article that traditionally the view of Canada was focused on the larger metropolitan areas. That is how the view of Canada evolved and it was the determining factor. While that view is still valid, it is not the only valid view for Canadians. The view seen from a small Saskatchewan town, from a coastal community in British Columbia or from Newfoundland is as valid for the development of Canada as is the view held in the traditional centres of opinion in this country. That is central to what we are discussing here. When we discuss Ottawa, that word is not used to deprecate the city or the central government. Rather, it is an expression of the view that whatever comes from the treasury benches here is more valid than the view from any other part of the country. I cannot accept that. I want to say why.

● (1740)

The federal government says that regardless of the fact that the matter is before the courts, it is going to use its majority to pass unilaterally a definition of Canada lands. That definition of Canada lands is such that everything which is not clearly defined by provincial boundaries is automatically Canada lands. That is the general thrust of Bill C-48. Those people who are affected by activity outside provincial boundaries such as citizens living in Newfoundland will obviously be affected by offshore activity such as fishing, drilling for gas and oil or whatever. The person living north of the 60th parallel in the Territories will also be affected. Those affected by these boundaries will be subject first to the view of this government and the definition in this bill.

The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) is trying to change the definition in the bill. What is fundamental in what the amendment does is that it says that what is effective on land in terms of resource ownership and management, should be operative offshore.

I found it rather interesting that the minister brought forward his strongest argument against this motion for the following reason. I cannot quote him word for word, but I hope I am paraphrasing him accurately, or at least repeating correctly the sense of what he was trying to project. He said he could not accept this motion because the premiers could then do offshore what they are doing on land.

What are they doing on land? They are drilling for oil, for natural gas, building tar sands plants and trying to create the Cold Lake project. That is what they are doing on land.

Mr. Simmons: They are stopping the Cold Lake project.

Mr. Epp: Yes, and you know why. This government is only willing to give them \$18.75 a barrel, and yet it will give Mexico \$40. What the premiers are doing on land is moving Canadians toward energy self-sufficiency, not only with regard to fossil fuels but in developing hydroelectric power.

The premier of my province has been working with other premiers in western Canada to develop a hydroelectric energy grid which would tie in not only with other parts of Western Canada but with other projects as well. Megaprojects, hydroelectric projects, oil and gas projects require co-operation. The