

has placed income in the hands of those who are raising children, and this increase in income has more than offset the amount of inflation we experienced during the past year, since the figure now averages \$20 per month per child across Canada.

As far as old age security and the guaranteed income supplement are concerned, last year single pensioners had their pensions raised to \$183.99 a month. Married couples received, with the guaranteed income supplement, \$351.02. Both payments are escalated on a quarterly basis to accommodate the increase in the cost of living. To say that these are not steps in the right direction is to say nothing at all.

I have heard many people talk of the problems confronting those on fixed incomes. We all know these problems exist, but in a very real way now, the number of those on fixed incomes, compared with one year ago, has dropped. By escalating the OAS and GIS payments in line with the cost of living increase, these incomes are no longer fixed but are escalated in line with the real cost of living. That fact ought to be taken into account by anyone who looks at the situation in an objective way.

The throne speech also makes many references to oil policy, agricultural policy, transportation, urban affairs, and so on, and I should like to address myself briefly to a number of these items. First of all, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced the government's oil policy in this House last December 6, if I remember correctly. I strongly applaud the steps that were taken at that time—indeed, the steps taken even prior to that time—so as to make sure that increases in the international price of oil would not accrue to the major oil companies but would in fact be preserved for Canadians. This was done through the action of the federal government in co-operation with the provinces. That was an important step; it made sure these windfall profits generated by the increased demand for oil in the world and by the war in the Middle East were not inherited by the oil companies. I am sure all Canadians would basically agree with that.

I also applaud the decision at that time to build an oil pipeline from the west to the east. At this stage of the game this means from Ontario to Quebec. I, along with many others, advocated the need for an all-Canadian pipeline and I am delighted that the government has announced construction of an interim pipeline along a southern route, with construction of an all-Canadian line over the long term. This is particularly important because I, as a Canadian, am not very comfortable when I realize that an energy-carrying line from the west to the east can have the valve closed, at least theoretically, by Washington. If we are to be independent in name as well as in fact, I think we must make sure we have total security of supply within this country; and I think the decision the government made at that time is consistent with this over-all view regarding the preservation of a Canadian national identity and sovereignty.

I feel very strongly that Canada cannot survive as a nation unless we have what I feel is a very basic requirement in this country, a common market. A common market means that the resources of all the provinces are essentially to be used for the benefit of all Canadians from coast to coast. Thus, I applaud the action the government

*The Address—Mr. Cafik*

has taken in the face of enormous criticism from many quarters, particularly on the opposite side of the House, to stand firm for what is Canadian as opposed to what is provincial or local. I think we must stand firm with a national policy to ensure that the resources of this country are used for the benefit of all Canadians.

I also applaud the establishment of a Canadian petroleum corporation. I hope its initial purpose, that of pursuing research and development of the Athabasca tar sands and that sort of thing, will be extended to give us a far greater degree of control over our national resources so that we as Canadians can reap the benefit rather than the multinational oil corporations and private individuals. I think that all Canadians understand that although oil prices need not increase in Canada on the basis of cost increases at the wellhead, in the long run the price of petroleum products in Canada will increase since new technology has to be developed to extract oil from the tar sands.

Many would argue that this means the price of oil in Canada today ought to be increased so as to provide funds for this kind of research. I would not object to that, provided the increase was reasonable and staged and the increased revenue was in fact used toward achieving that goal. However, I object very strongly to this argument being used as an excuse to provide higher incomes to the multinational oil corporations for the production of oil already discovered in this country and which does not cost them one nickel more to produce. I would like Canadians to have an absolutely iron-clad guarantee that the extra benefits oil companies receive are used for the development of new resources in the interests of Canadians, and not in the interests of the multinational oil companies and their investors.

● (1710)

I think the same principle ought to apply, with very strong safeguards, in respect of the tremendous advantages the oil companies and other resource development companies have enjoyed through tax incentives. These special tax privileges must be used to undertake research and development. That would be fair. But if these companies are really using the money that accrues from increased prices and tax incentives for the purposes of development, why cannot we do it through a national corporation? If they do not enjoy a rip-off through this kind of incentive, then they should be as happy as we parliamentarians to see that that money controlled by the government is earmarked, in co-operation with them, for specific purposes rather than going into their treasuries.

I also wish to speak briefly about the emphasis on agriculture which was contained in the Speech from the Throne. Agriculture is essential to our economy. There is not much doubt that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) has done a superb job in representing the interests of the farmers. In this area, the matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne are very important. It says we must provide an adequate supply of food in our own country at reasonable prices both for the consumer and for the producer. Obviously, this is not an easy equation to work out, but in terms of principle it is highly desirable. A large number of steps are outlined to achieve this objective. I want to bring just two or three of them to the