

through this bill which will do so much damage to the development of regional and economic expansion in Canada?

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member will agree that the point he is raising is far from being a point of order. If he wishes to argue some of the implications of the legislation, he will be invited to take the floor after the parliamentary secretary has completed his remarks.

Mr. Cullen: I thank the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona for his intervention. I did intend to deal with other aspects of his address. He made specific reference to Petrosar. I thought he did it in a serious vein, without filibustering and wanted some comment from this side on this subject. It seemed that through his comments he was doing precisely what he said he did not want the government to do, namely, to act in some form of divisive way.

The hon. member's argument could have had some merit back in 1967 or 1968 when the petrochemical industry decided there was not room for a world-scale plant in Canada and Canada could not support it. As a result of the problem that was faced by the petrochemical industry, I am happy to say that the then minister of industry, trade and commerce, the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, established a committee to look into the problems of the petrochemical industry as they affected both western Canada and eastern Canada. Coming out of that was an excellent report which, as the president of Petrosar said only recently, indicated there is now room, and by the end of the 1980's will be room for three world-scale plants in Canada, including the one in Sarnia, Petrosar. The Dow-Dome operation, or something comparable to it, should be built in Alberta. There will be spin-off industries from that.

I do not think there is any necessity to fight among the petrochemical companies or the provinces. I think adequate opportunity will be given the petrochemical industry to develop. For hon. members to say we should not have Petrosar because it will not operate to the benefit of the petrochemical industry in Alberta is just not in accordance with the facts. The hon. member had better update his history of the petrochemical industry and read what is said by the people involved in that particular enterprise.

● (2010)

The other question raised by the hon. member had to do with how the Minister of Finance could dovetail his approach in Canada with the one he has had to adopt at the International Monetary Fund. The minister handled that question this afternoon. I think the hon. member was in his seat when the Minister of Finance responded, and I think responded appropriately. The problem is that the OPEC countries have these many billions of dollars which in some way have to be recycled. We are facing a situation where a province has many millions of dollars in its coffers, appropriately enough, and we have to decide how to handle them. It is the responsibility of the federal government to see the money is used not only to the advantage of Alberta but also that it is not used to the disadvantage of other provinces or to the disadvantage of the Canadian economy. Surely that is the minister's role as Minister of Finance.

Income Tax

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Cullen: I thought for the moment, Mr. Chairman, that another cabinet minister had walked in. I knew they were very popular, but I did not realize how popular. It must have been a good party over the supper hour.

The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona misses the point if he feels that the stance taken by the Minister of Finance in Canada and that taken by him at the International Monetary Fund are not consistent. In point of fact we have the advantage of a Minister of Finance who operates, and is asked to operate, as the chairman of an interim committee in the field of international economics. Not only does he chair this committee but he chairs what is probably one of the most important and strongest committees in the international economic field. This is not only to his credit, but in a vicarious way all Canadians can take pleasure from the fact that a Canadian minister of finance was asked to chair this particular interim committee. I have enjoyed the privilege—

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think we have had a very useful, instructive and entertaining debate on this issue, or we did until about 15 minutes ago. We are now ready to have this matter tested in this committee.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Andre: You people are holding up the committee.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): What arrogance.

The Chairman: Order, please. The Chair also has a point of privilege; it would like to hear the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Baldwin: I want to say to the Minister of Finance, and to those other hon. gentlemen who are intervening in this debate, that we are prepared to bring this matter to a vote. However, if they are determined to continue this debate, it may continue for some time. I want to say the decision rests with them.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): More threats.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the same point of order. Now that he is back fit and fresh for work, the hon. member for Peace River wants to pose as an authority on the time we spent considering this bill. I would like to indicate to him that, during his absence, when there was no leader to conduct the debate in the House, we were giving Bill C-49 in-depth consideration—

The Chairman: I understand very well, but still—

[*English*]

Two wrongs do not make a right. I think the hon. member's point of privilege is no more valid than the one raised by the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised at my hon. friend from Peace River. He has not enjoyed the advantage I have had of sitting here and listening to all