

significant, since we had the favourable article quoted from Winnipeg. Here is one from *The Toronto Sun* which reads:

Assuming one is possible, how long would a post-Trudeau reconstruction period take?

That is just one question he raises.

It has already been pointed out in this and other spaces that changing our economic foundation (which is what Trudeau has done) cannot be accomplished overnight. There is also an argument (and a reasonable one) to be made for saying it will take longer to fix it than it did to harm it—

How did Trudeau change us? Simple:

1. He made not working socially acceptable.
2. Profit was shortened to a four-letter word.
3. Non-productive elements in our society came to be seen as equal to (and in some cases better than) productive elements.
4. Initiative, society's grease, was discouraged.

That is a simple and simplistic summation of 12 years of power, I know, but it will have to do.

Let us take another newspaper. The headline reads "Ottawa may push deficit on provinces". It may do it in many ways. Ottawa is blaming the provinces for those items over which the federal government had control. During the last two campaigns we listened to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) complain about health services, but it was the minister who could not extract consistent and sustained grants to the provinces as her share of the health program, and then she blamed the provinces which are strained in their expenditures by the welshing of the federal government on its responsibilities and commitments. That is what happened.

One could go on about the other ways in which the government is trying to push onto the provinces the responsibility for programs initiated and financed by the federal government. This will not work in this country. Again this is confrontation and avoidance of realities. I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the speeches of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and of the Minister of Finance can be considered repugnant and reprehensible delivered by men both lacking in conscience and concern and utterly refusing to face the realities of the economics of energy demand, finance, monetary and fiscal policies, men blind to the realities and not concerned about the consequences. They would give you Epsom salts for appendicitis.

● (0030)

I must say that I was seriously offended this morning to hear the Government of Canada complaining about the money it cannot spend. It is cutting community improvement policies, but is advertising that the Government of Canada will do great things for the ladies. The Liberal government will give them great opportunities. Ministers will advertise it and try to confuse the people of Canada, particularly the ladies, with the reality of the economic and energy policies of the country. It is deceptive in a fashion which should just not be tolerated or accepted by the people of Canada. Every red herring which could be drawn across the trail of division of the Canadian people has been put there by advertising, by policy, and by what can be pushed to deceive and conceal.

Economic Conditions

To deceive and conceal has been the policy of the government. It has deceived and concealed in the fact that it has kept the energy price down and subsidized imports, and the taxpayer pays. What is the difference between the taxpayer being punished in a tax fashion or going to the pump and paying the price of oil? The government has tried to let people think that this stuff is free, that it will always be cheap, but it does not mention to the same deceived people that they pay it in taxes, or that their grandchildren will pay for their deficit. They will either pay at the tank or by way of tax; they have a choice.

An hon. Member: Pay now or pay later.

Mr. McCain: How long have we deferred Canadian self-sufficiency? Has it been one year, three years or five years? Have we put it out of reach? They have called every oil company in Canada, owned here or otherwise, culprits. They have used the four letter word for profit. They have completely and utterly discouraged initiative.

The attempt to deceive tonight has been extended one step further by saying that oil rigs have not yet left. I happen to know one person in the oil drilling business and that 60 per cent of his equipment went out of the country in the crisis which arose between 1973 and 1974 when the government went off in an equally half-cocked way. Not only did 60 per cent of that equipment leave the country over an 18-month period, I do not think all of it came back. They have started the same exodus. The trend is there, the future is spelled out. To try to tell Canadians that this is not happening is repugnant and reprehensible. It is just utterly deceiving the people of Canada.

We must recognize that this is a free society so far, but when the new constitution passes I doubt it will ever be again.

Some hon. Members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. McCain: If hon. members opposite would read the comments submitted by some people who are very knowledgeable on the constitution, they would be ashamed, frightened, and move out. I sat here and I never opened my mouth when anyone spoke, but members opposite cannot give me the same courtesy.

That is the trend, and if it is not reversed within three months' time—and that might be too late—the country is out of luck, and we may have put self-sufficiency five, ten or 15 years down the line. As I said, how do we reverse it? It will take longer to correct it than it did to destroy it.

This is a competitive world. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Speaker. If you had money in the oil business which could be invested abroad, and you could see a secure economic opportunity to profit, that is where you would put your money. The government is driving that money into the competitive economic world where the little guy or the big guy is of some consequence, but the driving of that capital is outward. It was brought on by the budget of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and the policies of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.