wan, and it will give the mining industry of British Columbia a final shove on the slippery slope of socialism whereon it has already commenced its downward slide. That, Mr. Speaker, in broad terms is the industrial condition. What about the provincial governments and federal government confrontations? I can hear the constitutional battle; this House and all provincial legislatures will ring with the sour notes of bitterness and alarm.

Finally, I would end with a question. In the past few months we have witnessed the uncertainties created in the poultry industry and in the eyes of the consumer over the subject of rotten eggs. The government has responded with a review, a study of the problem. In fairness, we must await recommendations regarding this unsavoury problem before, hopefully, solutions are implemented. For over a year we have witnessed uncertainties in the beef industry. In many cases these uncertainties have been calamities—calamities to cow-calf operations and calamities to the sensibilities of Canadians viewing the slaughter of 600 calves. The government has responded: we will get a review of the beef industry. Again, in fairness, we must await recommendations before, hopefully, solutions are effected.

But once Bill C-32 becomes law and still contains the constitutional glove in the face, part III, how will this government respond? What possible review, what possible recommendations will it make that will not leave the bitter taste of doubt and mistrust in the provinces of this nation. And as an extension to that question, and speaking to the future, I ask, what possible review and what possible recommendations will this government make if the Minister of Finance further erodes federal-provincial relations with a raw resources taxation policy that may well break the back of the mining and petroleum industries of Canada? Let us have an energy policy, Mr. Speaker, but an energy policy that the minister can sleep with, that the opposition can agree with and that governments and the people can live with.

I note from the Ottawa *Journal* of Thursday, November 7, that the Minister of Finance is now expressing concern regarding the fouled-up federal equalization formula. The minister said he will be presenting a proposition. It has been my experience that every time I have heard a proposition, somebody is had. In this case it will be the provinces. I note, further, that the Minister of Finance is thinking in terms of a short-term arrangement. That, too, sounds like a proposition and a further indication of the failure of this government to develop long-term planning. Again we see, according to the press, the further probability of federal-provincial confrontation. What future propositions will the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources have in store both for the provinces and for the people.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, today we are considering Bill C-32, a bill to impose a charge on the export of crude oil and certain petroleum products, to provide compensation for certain petroleum costs and to regulate the price of Canadian crude oil and natural gas in interprovincial and export trade. This bill is similar to the one introduced last April. Since then, conditions have changed. However, I still feel that some of the powers proposed in this bill should not be granted. I feel now as I did when I last spoke on this legislation.

Before commenting on any specific clause, may I point out that I have asked the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan) questions concerning the export tax on oil produced from lands owned by Indian bands. I refer particularly to Alberta, although this matter applies also to other provinces. So far my questions have been ignored.

In September, 1973, the government introduced an export tax on oil. It promised to give back 50 per cent of the tax to the producing provinces. The other 50 per cent was to be held in the federal treasury, to be used for research in resource development. Subsequently, the government realized that it was levying the export tax on oil produced on Indian lands. That tax money was accumulating in the federal treasury. Although the federal government had collected the export tax from October, 1973, to April 1, 1974, the Indian people have not had the benefit of one dollar of that tax. I raised this matter in my speech of April 8 when we were considering the previous bill, and the minister said he would look into it. Eight months later the money remains in the treasury. At least, I hope it is still there. I do not know how many millions of dollars are there for the benefit of our native peoples. Perhaps the minister will clear up this matter either in the question period or in committee.

When is the government prepared to distribute this money to the Indian bands? Rightfully it is theirs. It will help them to build houses, to buy machinery, to raise their general standard of living and, as in my riding, to purchase the equipment necessary to farm their lands. This would mean they would no longer need to rent land. I submit that although the future development of the tar sands will benefit our Indian people, the bulk of the benefit will go to the rest of Canada. The tax money referred to belongs to the Indian people. They should be allowed to invest it as they see fit in order that they may improve their prospects. As the government has been tardy in turning over this money to our Indian people, it should, when it does pay it back, pay it back with interest accrued for the last eight months. One could argue that the tax collected since April 1, 1974, with respect to oil produced on Indian lands should be returned to our Indian bands. The amount, insignificant on the national scale, is most significant to the Indian people of this country.

The government, in its last budgetary proposals, wanted royalties paid by oil companies to provinces to be not deductible from income tax which those companies might owe the federal government. In essence, that proposal would have resulted in double-taxation of oil producers. Canadian oil and gas companies would pay income tax on moneys collected as royalties by provincial governments. Nowhere else in the world is a company required to pay tax on royalties it pays to a government. Ignoring the constitutional ramifications of the foregoing, which others have dealt with, let us examine how the $11.70 per barrel of oil is broken down. The federal government collects, at present, about $5.20 per barrel in export tax. The provincial government collects $2.60 per barrel as royalty. This leaves the producer with $3.90, $1 of which is consumed in