

mentioned in the agreement, the international price, whatever that may be.

We may have to develop the facilities to handle that product ourselves. I suggest that the moneys put into this company under this joint venture will yield huge profits to those companies putting up the money, and the federal government and provincial governments in the joint venture will not take advantage of those same concessions.

Syncrude will go down in history without a doubt as an immense sell-out. My colleague has said it is a greater sell-out than the CPR scandal. I am not sure if it will be in the same league at all. It will be 100 times larger than the CPR scandal, and we will have to stay in it. I think that if we are going to make an exception through the Financial Administration Act of providing rebates to the companies, then we should have no rebate at all. Instead that money should be Canadian money and it should cover the whole operation of that corporation.

If there were ever a good time for public ownership, it is now for Syncrude because it would be in the interest of the public, in the interest of development in an orderly fashion of a totally new form of energy resource for the Canadian people. Even more important, it would keep this government honest and prevent it from having to use exceptions under this act, the Financial Administration Act, or through some other act.

If the government allows an exception in this instance, I suggest that there will be immense pressure on it to allow that kind of exemption for all companies. I suggest that that is not fair or reasonable taxation, and that we should not force this government into it.

I would like to call it ten o'clock and continue my remarks at another time.

Mr. Young: On a point of order, Madam Chairman, since we are just reaching that point, I would like to move under Standing Order—

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. It being ten o'clock it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to consider the bill again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Madam Speaker, may I ask the government House leader who is—

An hon. Member: Which one?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is no doubt which one is the leader on this side of the House. In any event, in the spirit of friendship which has prevailed in the House this evening, may I ask what is to be the business for tomorrow?

Adjournment Debate

● (2200)

Mr. Sharp: I had hoped to say that the next order of business would be the Housing Act, because I know the people of Canada are very anxious to get it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: In the circumstances we shall continue in committee of the whole on the Income Tax bill, and I do hope the House will co-operate in getting it through as quickly as possible in order that we can move on to the housing bill, which will be the next item of business.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): May I say that the opposition will not emulate government supporters tonight with respect to co-operation in getting the business through the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Sit down!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): They will find I do not sit down too easily.

An hon. Member: Or shut up!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We intend to co-operate with the government but we have been subjected to a spectacle which has been a travesty of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It does not become the government House leader to ask for co-operation on this side, something he has always received, when he has no control over his own supporters.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

HARBOURS—HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSION—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT IMPLICATED IN COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Madam Speaker, today when I asked the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) a question about a transcript at a preliminary inquiry involving the Hamilton Harbour Commission, his answer disappointed me because I felt he was being unnecessarily vague. I realize the Solicitor General has a difficult role to fulfil. On the one hand he must give