

*Income Tax*

**Mr. McRae:** The mighty Churchill river is being diverted into the Nelson river.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. McRae:** Some projects must be reconsidered on the basis of our need. Do we in effect need that diversion? What will that electricity be generated for? Will it be generated for domestic use or for sale to the United States?

**Mr. Epp:** You don't know what you are talking about.

**The Chairman:** Order, please. We are experiencing some difficulty in trying to keep order. The hon. member raised a point of order which the Chair did not hear because of problems with communication. However, I think that if hon. members would address themselves to the Chair instead of directly to one another, it would simplify matters and might bring more progress to the debate.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McRae:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest one or two things that we must do in order to cut this \$107 billion down to a manageable amount. One of my suggestions has to do with the conservation of resources, a matter which has been discussed in the House for the last few weeks. Another has to do with the cutting back of exports. I am not just talking about the export of oil and gas, because this has been dealt with already. I am talking about the export of electricity not only in the pure form but in semi-processed form as in enriched uranium. Somewhere along the line we must take a long look at how we are going to cut this \$107 billion.

**Some hon. Members:** Time is up.

**Mr. McRae:** I could go on for a long time, but first I would like to ask the minister if he would comment on the long term effects of these royalties and on whether or not he foresees a situation where the federal government will have to cut back on some of the projects. I would like him to comment also about working with the provinces and sharing the results of these royalties with all Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Smith (Churchill):** As I listened to the hon. member for Fort William I realized that he knows nothing of this subject which he spoke about, namely, the diversion of water in the Churchill constituency. If he did his homework he would know that the federal government is involved in this project, as is the provincial government. I think he should do his homework before he starts running off at the mouth on things that he knows nothing about.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. McRae:** I want to say that I may have been mistaken, but I must say that for two or three years I have been greatly concerned about the Churchill river, and also about the fact that the Indian people in that area have not been given any guarantees or recompense for the flooding.

[Mr. McRae.]

I am also concerned that a mighty river like the Churchill will be dried up.

**The Chairman:** Order, please. Although part of the question might have been out of order, it is certain that the answer is also.

● (2040)

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

[Translation]

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Chairman, I want to deal directly with the amendment before the House—

**An hon. Member:** Take your time.

**Mr. Blais:** —because, to my mind, the whole debate, which has now lasted for over 12 days, hinges on this amendment to Bill C-49. Indeed, the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) is a manifestation of the wishes of the Progressive Conservative members from Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, you will remember that, last year, in 1974, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) introduced in the House a bill on oil administration intended to legislate, and set up the system agreed upon by all the provinces and the federal government. At that time, the hon. members from Alberta wanted to oppose the adoption of that bill because they feared somewhat the provisions of the Turner budget announced for the month of May.

Once that budget was introduced by the government and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner), they opposed the bill on oil administration and the budget because, under the circumstances, neither the bill nor the budget were acceptable to the hon. members from Alberta because those nice gentlemen considered that the federal government was intervening needlessly in a field of provincial jurisdiction. Which was absolutely untrue. And why do I say that it is untrue, Mr. Chairman? Simply because, even though the Progressive Conservatives and the New Democrats have tried again and again to bring the people to their ideas, they failed completely. They have had all the chance in the world, Mr. Chairman, because since May 1974, we have been discussing only these blasted provisions in the House. Since 1974, we have been making legislation only in the interest of the province of Alberta. In spite of all the respect I have for that province and its people, I do not think the House ought to think only of them.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that if you gave us another fortnight, we would still be discussing this same amendment.

[English]

I appreciated the comments of the Chair a while back, that each and every one of us has an obligation to this House. I have been strongly advocating Standing Order 75C to limit the debate in this House—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!