

Energy Policy

electricity program where half of the 10,000 people are receiving diesel power. They have to get diesel and not hydro.

I could go on with a number of other reasons which show that Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island should not be singled out from the other provinces with respect to all these needs. By 1980, 40 per cent of the people of Newfoundland will be depending on oil-fired steam power. We cannot use coal and we cannot use nuclear: we have only one alternative to our hydro power in Newfoundland, and that is oil. We will hear the minister attempt, if he can, to justify this discrimination when he speaks. I say to the people of the other eight provinces that it is time they woke up and put some pressure on this government to start treating them fairly and start offering them the same energy conservation grants that householders in Nova Scotia and P.E.I. have been offered, as well as those in the Northwest Territories. This is not an energy conservation policy. This is a policy of political politroony, political preference. It is the rankest kind of discrimination.

I do not know the population figures, but at least 90 per cent of the people of Canada should be getting this. They should all be able to reduce the energy consumption in their homes across the country. I will be interested in hearing how the minister is going to continue to support this as a policy for those two provinces without extending it to the rest of us across this country who are so badly in need. As a matter of fact, unless he does change that policy I will try, as I said last night, to get his salary reduced to two cents when the estimates come before the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: His energy strategy reads well until one looks to see how it is being carried out. It then becomes intermingled with the rankest kind of political consideration.

I now come to the second reason for moving this motion that the government's policies are unfair and unjust to the rest of the people of Canada. There are a dozen reasons and these will be discussed by other speakers. I shall only touch on two or three. I refer to the government's offshore minerals policy. The Liberal government in Ottawa argues that it owns and must control offshore mineral rights off the west and east coasts of Canada, our reserves of oil and gas. The Northwest Territories are not enough for them, the territories they already own; they want to own the resources that lie off both coasts.

An hon. Member: All three coasts.

Mr. Crosbie: However many coasts. They already have the Northwest Territories. In 1967 they got an opinion from the Supreme Court of Canada that in fact the federal government owns the continental shelf and controls and owns all the minerals that might lie off British Columbia. They got this through a narrow legalistic interpretation of the constitution. Because of that they are now attempting to claim that they own and must control the minerals that lie off the east coast as well. Why? What is the difference between minerals that lie under the land in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and minerals

that are under the water off Newfoundland, Nova Scotia or British Columbia? Why, because they are under the water, should they belong to the government of Canada? If some court, through narrow legalistic reasoning, finds that the federal government has technical ownership, why should that government insist upon it? It would only insist upon it if it was a centralizing government, a government that does not believe in federalism, a government that does not care whether the provinces stand or fall.

Does this government want the provinces to remain weak financially and subservient to the central power? The government has aggravated and irritated provinces such as Alberta and Saskatchewan because they want to use their own resources for their own benefit and get as much as they can out of it. It is the kind of government which claims it owns them and therefore is going to control them. That is the attitude of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

The federal government has entered into agreement with the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. At the beginning of February they made public an abbreviated version of the agreement reached with those three provinces. They have no agreement with Newfoundland or Quebec because we do not ever intend to agree with the Liberal policy in this direction. However, they have secured agreement with these three provinces which are not as strong as Newfoundland.

We were treated to a fantastic exhibition. Premier Regan almost laughed himself silly because he was so happy about this agreement. Why would he go along with such a piece of play-acting, because it is a pernicious agreement, an agreement that leaves all control with the government of Canada. It does not help those provinces fundamentally at all. The agreement gives away the control over oil and gas and the regulation of what the royalty system is going to be: all that is left with the government of Canada. The provinces are told they can have 75 per cent of the royalties or fees that might come from the areas where these minerals are discovered. Why was Premier Regan so happy? Why was he laughing and chuckling so much? He has an election coming up this year and has to try and make it sound like it really amounts to something. What will it be 75 per cent of? It will be 75 per cent of what the federal government decides it is going to be. Those three provinces will have no control over the administration, no control over the pace of development, no control over whether they go with companies that put their facilities on shore or not, or whether they have to employ Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers or Prince Edward Islanders. That will all be left to the minister and his government.

Would any one laugh and say this is a tremendous monument to confederation, if he did not have an ulterior purpose? There is only one reason—the election. Premier Regan should be crying all the way to the legislative assembly because of what he had to accept from the federal Liberals.

In addition, it has not yet been revealed—and it may be changed as I am revealing it—that the federal government is insisting that these three provinces cannot impose any provin-

[Mr. Crosbie.]