

1969 and representations by provincial governments in the 1970s in this regard; but the government's response has been nil.

I mentioned earlier that one heavy oil upgrading plant would meet the deficiency we are now dealing with which really triggered the introduction of this piece of legislation. We are talking about a vast quantity of energy resources regarding heavy oil supplies. It has been estimated that there is something in the order of 30 billion to 40 billion barrels of heavy oil in place in the province of Alberta, with perhaps an equal amount in the province of Saskatchewan, and that does not take into account the tar sands.

Since the OPEC crisis in 1973 we have had one tar sands plant put in place, we have had the pipeline extension and we have had Petro-Canada. I congratulate the minister for his interest in heavy oils. He did come out to Lloydminster to see this at first hand, but until that visit I am sure he never really realized the potential of heavy oil.

This is really where we stand: we do not have the kind of imaginative and challenging leadership we need. That was really evident, and it is still evident because there really has been no progress made to upgrade heavy oils in order that they can be fed into our light crude refining facilities.

I see that my time is up, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McRae).

An hon. Member: Oh no.

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make two or three very short comments. I want to deal with some of the questions the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) posed in the last few minutes but will do so later at the third reading stage. I would like to comment now on two or three things mentioned by the last two or three speakers, particularly by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). That hon. member asked the minister a long series of questions, most of which were dealt with in the committee. They were the kinds of questions that should be dealt with at that stage.

However, it is very interesting to note that when this bill was at the committee, as far as I can discover, having attended most of the meetings and read the transcripts of the proceedings, there was not a single Atlantic provinces Tory member present to put forward the concerns of the Atlantic provinces. Basically speaking, we were dealing with the interests of the west, Alberta and British Columbia, represented by members on the Tory side at the committee, and Ontario. There may have been someone who crept in at some particular point—

Mr. Lawrence: We were there speaking for Canada.

Energy Supplies

Mr. McRae: I am concerned with the kinds of comments made by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think this is a very genuine point, Mr. Speaker. First of all, by tradition of this House we do not permit members of this House to reflect upon the motives or lack thereof of members, or whether or not they were at the committee. I should point out to the hon. member, who really was not that constant in his own attendance at the committee, that there was at least one member from Halifax, and one member from Newfoundland, both Conservative members, who were in constant attendance at these committee meetings. I think the hon. member should withdraw the implication of what he has just said.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. McRae: I will not withdraw until I see the names in print. I was at most of the meetings, certainly last week and—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member will just allow me to make a comment. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) has made a valid point with which I agree. Hon. members are prevented by the rules from reflecting on the motives or conduct of their colleagues in proceedings of the House. I am not in a position to decide about something that happened in committee. I am sure the hon. member did not intend to do that for which he has been reproached by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham. Perhaps he will explain his comment or modify it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on the same point of order?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No, this is another point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have invited the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McRae) to perhaps modify his remark, and that maybe would solve the difficulty.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this may have occurred during a fuss that was taking place in the House, but in defence of the hon. member I wanted to point out that I thought he had said that he withdrew the remark.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, he said he would not.

Mr. McRae: Mr. Speaker, I will accept the ruling of the Chair and withdraw the remarks if I am not allowed to discuss or make comment in the House about whether members, collectively and generally rather than as individuals, were at committee meetings. If that is the case then I withdraw the remark. I would not withdraw the remark on the basis of its