

could be processed, and this growth would make a lot more sense for all Canadians in those areas as well as people living in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal.

I look forward to the Minister of Finance being very co-operative with this House and decent to the Canadian people and separating this bill, or making some kind of accommodation so that the first ministers in April can sit down with the Prime Minister with a deck which is not stacked, which does not have a joker inside it. I look forward to the Minister of Finance exhibiting that leadership in this House. If he does not do that, then perhaps the hon. member for Timiskaming was right when he said this bill may not pass for three or four months.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I answered the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain yesterday on his proposal, and it can be found at page 3163 of *Hansard*, but I tabled an amendment which I said I would introduce at this stage. It is a technical amendment adding the words "by a taxpayer" to line 22 on page 4. Without those words the ownership of the Canadian resource property was not identified with any person.

I would like to move an amendment, and I am going to rely on Beauchesne, citation 204 (2), which I think will save the time of the House. The amendment has already been tabled, but the motion is:

That clause 4 of Bill C-49 be amended

- (a) by striking out line 22 on page 4 and substituting the following:
"ownership by a taxpayer of a Canadian resource"
- (b) by striking out line 42 on page 5 and substituting the following:
"6, 1974 to November 18, 1974 paragraph"
- (c) by striking out line 33 on page 6 of the French version and substituting the following:
"*sonnablement être considéré comme dépendant de la production au Canada*".

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nystrom: I just wondered whether the minister could perhaps explain the amendment. It is very difficult to get the purport of it when I have not seen a written version.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We tabled the amendment, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is merely a technical one. Unless the words "by a taxpayer" are added, there is no way of attributing the taxability to anyone. It is merely a technical amendment. It does not change the substance at all, I can assure the hon. gentleman of that.

An hon. Member: Maybe that is the way it should be, John, attributing it to no one.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If the hon. gentleman wants some good legal advice he can turn to the hon. member for Broadview. You will recall the advice I was giving was that advice is only worth what you pay for it.

Mr. Saltsman: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the necessity of inserting "by a taxpayer" arises from the fact that, in the case of some Crown corporations, they are not going to be taxpayers and there-

fore are exempt from these particular provisions. Was it inserted for the purpose of exempting some Crown corporations or people or organizations who do not pay taxes?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, this does not deal with that particular problem. That is hypothetical.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. If you are dealing with the amendment I will rise later.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Let us deal with the amendment and then allow the debate to continue. Could we have the question on the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)) agreed to.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You are driving your own boys out, Benjie.

Mr. Benjamin: I know. Mr. Chairman, my own boys have to go through this much more often than hon. members opposite. This clause is obviously the most contentious one in the whole bill. I was hoping that members from all sides of this House would start thinking a little further about things like confederation and national unity. This has not been the case to date. As I said last week, I will not take a back seat to the Minister of Finance or anyone else in terms of a strong federal government and a strong confederation, but that is not accomplished by confrontation. That is not accomplished by arbitrary decision making. You only accomplish that and make it succeed and continue with some measure of agreement, accommodation and discussion and so forth. I am hopeful that my good and hon. friends to my right who come from all provinces in this country will take some part in the debate on this particular issue unless—and I hate to say this—their priorities are more on the side of multinational oil companies than they are on Canada's confederation and national unity.

If their concerns are more on that side, then I can understand why they may not particularly care. They may not particularly care if this clause carries readily. If they do care about what confederation is all about, then what is being attempted in clause 4 flies in the face of what they and hon. members on the government side have been saying since 1867.

Saskatchewan is perhaps one of the "Johnnie-come-lately" provinces in this country, but it still happens to believe that the provinces own their natural resources and are custodians of those resources. On behalf of the residents of their provinces they have the right to charge a reasonable—I repeat for the benefit of the Minister of Finance, a reasonable—or fair market value for the extraction and exploitation of the resources that lie within their boundaries, particularly those resources that are exploited by the private sector. We have heard a great deal from the minister and the premiers about fair market value and reasonable shares, and I should have liked to ask the minister a question. I do not blame him for being