

attention of the House the fact for almost two months he has not attended the sittings of the House.

[English]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Chairman, may I say quite sincerely that I do not blame the responsible parliamentary secretary for holding the floor until there were enough people here to carry the vote, but I would ask my hon. friends in the House to remember that this, after all, is the parliament of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Isn't that what we were last week?

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

An hon. Member: Don't be sanctimonious.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You're a pinhead, Macdonald.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I am not trying to be sanctimonious. As I said, I do not criticize the parliamentary secretary at all. In fact I should have thought there was something wrong with him had he not held the floor. I just think that things have gone far enough and we should remember where we are.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Order, please. I think the point made by the hon. leader of the opposition is well taken. Hon. members have as much responsibility in this House and to this country as does the Chair, and I suggest it is not the function of hon. members to ask the Chair to rule on abuses and the extravagance of certain speeches. I think it is the responsibility of every member of the House of Commons to keep up our standards. This is the responsibility of everyone here, whether he sits in the chair or on one side or the other of this chamber.

Mr. McRae: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying now for at least a month or a month and a half to speak on this bill, and I welcome the opportunity tonight to say a few words about resource taxation and the relationship between resources in this country and the federal and provincial governments.

There has been a great deal of small bickering going on in the last six or eight weeks that this bill has been kicking around, but I think a number of things have been missed. It is true that, under the British North America Act, resources for the most part are the preserve of the provinces. However, I think we must begin to think of ourselves in a very different way than we have in the past.

We are told that in the next 10 years capital investment intentions amount to about \$107 billion. In today's terms that amounts to the construction of 35 St. Lawrence Seaways over the same period of time. That is why I suggest we cannot afford the luxury in this country of all kinds of separate jurisdictions divvying up resource income. This \$107 billion will go into such projects as the James Bay project which will cost \$15 billion, the Mackenzie Valley gas pipe line, which is supposed to cost \$10 billion, and possibly an oil line which will cost \$10 billion or \$15

Income Tax

billion. This is what we are really talking about when we have before us bills concerning royalties or taxes in the long term in this area.

● (2030)

I believe firmly that the federal government and the provinces must come together to deal with this large amount of money, which may by now total \$120 billion or more. I think that this is what hon. members should talk about in this debate on royalties, the kinds of things that happen when this sort of money is being spent, the kinds of things that are happening, for instance, in the province of Quebec today when simultaneous activities are talking place such as the massive effort in the James Bay area and the preparation for the Olympics in Montreal. The impact of such activities on the construction industry and on capital funds is tremendous.

One must consider that the \$107 billion will amount to a doubling of energy capital expenditures over the 10 year period. In other words, 3 per cent will be doubled to 6 per cent of the gross national expenditure. This represents something like 15 per cent of the total capital dollars, and 15 per cent will be doubled to 30 per cent in the course of years in an economy that is fairly tight. This will inevitably create serious problems, and it is to this we should be addressing ourselves.

In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of many people, this \$107 billion to \$115 billion to \$120 billion is a ridiculous sum. Somewhere along the line governments in this country, the federal government representing all the people of Canada, and the provincial governments, must try to reach a consensus. They must sit down and say, "No, we cannot take that route". At some point along the line some of these projects must be cut off. When we are talking about resources, this will be the real crunch.

Let us take a look at some of these projects. Some of them are very important. Syncrude for instance, is absolutely vital. We must have a list of priorities, and I would put Syncrude at the top of the list because we must continue to develop oil where it is found. Some of the other projects, such as the nuclear enrichment plant, I would put low on the list because it is of little merit to Canadians. Another project, such as the diversion of the Churchill River into the South Indian lake, I would put very low on the list, especially if the mighty Churchill river is to be dried up in the process.

Some hon. Members: What are you saying?

The Chairman: Is the hon. member for Churchill rising on a point of order?

Mr. Smith (Churchill): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to clarify one point. It is not the diversion of the South Indian river into the Churchill, it is the diversion of the Churchill river.

Mr. McRae: I was talking about the mighty Churchill river being diverted into the South Indian lake and down into lake Manitoba.

Some hon. Members: No, no, you are still wrong.