

to the practical working policy we had before is a good move. We do not know what the effect will be of phasing out the surtax over this length of time in terms of prices and advantages to packers or producers. Certainly, it does give some advantage to some of the processors.

I point out to the government that it has made no move yet toward a real support policy for hogs and beef. This is essential and would be more effective than trying to manipulate the tariff. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) in a speech in Ontario recently, announced there would be a stabilization policy. I thought for a while he had put on the hat of the Minister of Agriculture because he said we should have support prices for hogs, cattle and so on, but he does not mention that in this statement. If we are to have adequate supplies of beef and increasing production, which should be our objective as a nation, then some moves will have to be made in that direction. Until now it has been left to provinces such as Saskatchewan to guarantee a floor price for hogs, for example, and this may be an area which is being overlooked.

The other point I should like to make concerns the relationship of feed supply to beef and hog production. During the question period today, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), for instance, pointed out the lack of feed supplies in Eastern Canada and the instability of the market. This is one area in which the government is falling down badly. The lack of policies on the pricing and transportation of feed grains is a serious matter. The interests of neither the seller nor the buyer are being served. The facts can be documented to prove what I say. I trust the government will take note of these important areas as well as juggling tariffs.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### OIL EXPORT CHARGE ACT

#### PROVISION OF EXPORT CHARGE, OIL EXPORT TAX UNDER EXCISE ACT AND ALLOCATION OF REVENUES FROM TAX

The House resumed, from Thursday, January 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-245, to impose a charge on the export of crude oil from Canada, to impose an oil export tax under the Excise Tax Act and to allocate certain of the revenues derived from the oil export tax, be read a second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, it is just a year ago today that this session began. It is just a year ago today that a great many members of this House had the privilege of assuming a seat in Canada's House of Commons for the first time. It is a privilege for which I am sure each member is grateful to his constituency. It is to be hoped that each has served his constituency well. It is regrettable, however, that during that year we have had the misfortune to observe a government in operation which has exploited its opportunities for evasion.

### Oil Export Tax

The government has exploited the rules of the House and has used this method to continue the secrecy surrounding of its behaviour. It has continued to keep the people of Canada in ignorance wherever possible. It has used the committee system of this House as a means for introducing ministerial statements, statements of policy and long drawn out statements by representatives of the departments. I think this has been done intentionally in order to make it utterly impossible for a committee of this House to function effectively and obtain the information necessary for an intelligent decision to be made in respect of the committee's report. There has been a deplorable neglect by the government of recognition of the democratic privileges on which the work of this House has so long been based. I am deeply disappointed when I hear such answers as we received this morning from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he said he would refer the matter to the minister concerned and gave no assurance that an answer would be forthcoming.

I was again deeply concerned to hear the typical reply of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) this morning when he suggested to this House that a matter was not anybody's business except his own, that he would let us know what he wanted us to know and no more, and that he would conduct himself in the way he felt was best for Canada, regardless of what anyone else thought. There has been a direct challenge to the democratic system. This has been a shortsighted systematic operation. There has not been any long-range policy. The government has operated on a short-term basis in respect of a problem which is publicly known because it has been written up in the newspapers. It has not been guided by a policy involving long-range foresight and long-range planning. The government has not taken the action necessary to ensure that the nation will have the social and economic policy which Canada deserves. This is a tired, drained out, incompetent cabinet which has led this country nowhere.

I submit to you, Sir, that this government does not have the respect the government should have and does not have the support of the voters of Canada. It has been demonstrated beyond any doubt that Canada needs a fresh and creative group, with imagination and capability for planning, which is not present in the structure of the government today. It is time that we had forthright, courageous leadership which will not be influenced by a Prime Minister who accepts only the advice of those on his political left who espouse ideas which seem to please him much more than the realities of Canada's economy. The indications are that there is a tryst or perhaps even a conspiracy between the Prime Minister and those who are practising socialists in the House, to take Canada along a collision course with the economic reality at a time when others who have learned lessons about the necessity for the exploitation of the best brains in their country have been going in the opposite direction.

• (1210)

At a time when the economic climate for the development of the resources has improved in other nations, we have been discussing in the House the fearsome subject of profits as if that were a dirty word. We have been discussing it in a way which has accused the industry and the private citizen who was seeking to make a living of being