

And the Alberta example, of course. I mean it is absurd, Mr. Chairman, but then it is not related to sense at all. It is pure politics.

Again the hon. member for Mississauga said:

—informed western Canadians would be shocked—by the careless and ill-informed questioning by people who come from that part of the country—

Then I would quote what the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) said when he rose on a point of order, as follows:

Given the attitude of the Alberta members, I wonder whether it would be safe if you put it in Alberta—

He was speaking of Petro-Can.

I could go on as there are a great many more, but I think it is important to point out that it can be documented that most of the banks with head offices in the central part of Canada give very few loans in the maritimes and the prairies. The same thing happens in respect of the government Industrial Development Bank. Let me point out that the province of Alberta, the province of Saskatchewan, and the province of Manitoba obtained collectively only 16.8 per cent of the value of the loans, and the Atlantic provinces obtained only 6.7 per cent, in contrast to the industrial provinces of Ontario and Quebec which obtained 52.3 per cent.

I will draw to a conclusion simply by saying that anyone who has recognized frustration in the west is recognizing fact. This does not for a single moment signal that there is an attempt to get out of confederation. What the people of those provinces are trying to do is get into confederation. What they want to do is share, but they do not want just to share their resources on a one-way street. They want to be able to have a voice—somewhat different than the representation which exists in this country, with the cities of Toronto and Montreal having more members of parliament than the three prairie provinces together.

I think there is good reason for the suggestion that Petro-Canada was not well received in the west. This is simply another step in 100 years of legislation that has not treated residents of the maritimes, the territories, or the prairies, with the respect of full Canadian citizenship, and that has to be recognized. The regions seek to be full members of Confederation.

\* \* \*

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Sharp:** Madam Speaker, I rise on the point of order I raised at eight o'clock. There has now been a clarification of the understanding among the House leaders in respect of the business for tomorrow. It is our intention tomorrow to call Bill C-63 as the first order of business under government orders and to dispose of all the votes on the report stage before one o'clock, and then to follow that, by agreement, with third reading of that bill and to dispose of that reading before four o'clock. If third reading is disposed of before four o'clock we will resume the debate on the excise tax bill.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Madam Speaker, the government House leader has indicated the understanding on which the government proposes that this measure be brought back. I

### Petro-Canada Act

just want to make this one addition. I am given to understand it is not the intention of the parties in the House to call for a recorded vote on third reading. It may be left to any party, any member, or any group of members to indicate their dissent in the usual way without a recorded vote. Should it happen that a recorded vote be called for, it is clearly understood that it will not take place until next week.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Madam Speaker, with the clarification by the House leader it seems that we do have the matter properly before us. There are just two comments I should like to make. The statement has been made that votes on the report stage amendments will be taken before one o'clock. I think the understanding was more precise than that, namely, that those votes would be called at 12.45 which means that the debate on the report stage must be ended then.

In respect of the question of there not being a recorded vote on third reading, I think we are all agreed on that. If we on the negative side shout loudly enough that the Chair declares the bill defeated then, of course, that will be that and we will not need a recorded vote.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):** Madam Speaker, we generally agree with the proposals. But we wonder whether there will be time to proceed with the three votes—we are told there are to be three votes at 12.45 p. m.—if we will have enough time, if the bell will ring long enough. In these circumstances, I fear we will not be able to have the three votes before two o'clock. That is the only thing that worries me.

The other statements aside, I am told there will not be a recorded vote at four o'clock. I hope I understood correctly.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it so agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

### PETRO-CANADA ACT

#### MEASURE TO ESTABLISH CROWN CORPORATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-8, to establish a national petroleum company, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington):** Madam Speaker, this bill to establish a national petroleum company merits our support for, among others, two very important reasons. First, Petro-Canada will increase the opportunities for industrial research and development in the crucial area of energy resource production. As I have shown in this House on several occasions, our industrial research and development effort in Canada is inadequate and appears very small, indeed, when compared with the activities in this area of other technologically advanced OECD countries.

As a Canadian company without multinational ties, Petro-Canada will require the establishment of an exten-