

Canada Oil and Gas Act

hydrocarbons, so they say. I hope it is true. Developers say that in Hibernia the oil is there, it has been found. Yet they are not taking it out of the seabed. They are not taking it from the seabed because it is not worth their while. They are not getting enough money, they say. I do not know whether that is true or not. But neither does the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to achieve energy self-sufficiency, which is the whole purpose of any energy program, we have to deal in an honest and sensible way with these problems. The Alberta tar sands project has to go ahead, not for the benefit of the government of Alberta but for the benefit of the manufacturers of Ontario, in order to make it possible to develop the massive machinery that is needed in Canada. These projects simply have to go ahead.

Nova Scotians and people from Prince Edward Island should know that they are affected by these matters, that it is a contribution to the national wealth and the economy. We are all affected. The task of the government is not to railroad Bill C-48 through this House by the force of its majority. The task of the government is to achieve energy self-sufficiency for Canadians. We can do it by developing the Arctic, by developing the Alberta tar sands and by continuing the search and development of oil and gas off the east coast of Canada. It can be done. The question is, why is the government not taking the action which will ensure that these projects are carried out?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on a number of other matters which are affected by this bill. But first I would like to comment on something said by the hon. member for Etobicoke North. The hon. member referred to the Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker and said he would have supported the National Energy Program. I can tell the hon. member that it is not so. If the right hon. gentleman were in this House, he would be out of his chair in a flash, and I will tell hon. members why. You will be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to know that I worked for an oil company in 1962 when the right hon. gentleman was prime minister.

● (2110)

Mr. Waddell: I am not surprised.

Mr. Crosby: I worked for legal aid too, a lot longer than you did, son.

Mr. Waddell: That is not true.

Mr. Crosby: The right hon. gentleman implemented a policy by which Canadian oil had to be used west of the Ottawa valley. That oil cost about \$10 or \$12 when the world price for oil was under \$2. He did not quarrel about the price of oil. He developed the Canadian oil industry. The hon. member could not be more wrong. Mr. Diefenbaker developed the Canadian oil industry by providing a price which allowed the industry to bring the oil out of the ground and to develop a viable industry in Alberta, which today is probably saving the Canadian economy.

The hon. member needs a lesson in history. Mr. Diefenbaker was willing to bite those bullets. He was willing to ensure that the Canadian industry was developed, and he was not going to quibble about prices. He was not going to argue with people. It had to be done, and he did it. That is why we have an oil industry today, and the hon. member opposite and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources are doing just the opposite. They are trying to destroy the Canadian energy industry by not taking a realistic view of the price. They are trying to buy off consumers in Nova Scotia and elsewhere with unrealistic policies which relate to pricing, the result of which is that the energy projects which are so necessary to achieving self-sufficiency in energy in Canada are being delayed, discontinued or abandoned. Oil rigs are leaving Canada. There is ample evidence of that. Projects are being delayed. We are not getting on with the business of energy self-sufficiency.

I think my time is coming to an end. However, there are many other problems involved in this bill and in this particular provision of the bill. It is partly a matter of trust. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and his government have lost the faith and the trust of the Canadian energy industry. That may be the biggest obstacle to development today. There is no longer the kind of trust in the government that is necessary to encourage the private sector to get on with the business of developing the projects necessary to achieve energy self-sufficiency.

I have spoken about western Canada but, of course, my heart is in the development of resources off the coasts of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. I do not believe for one minute that that development will go ahead in this climate of distrust. I do not believe that development will go ahead until the government re-examines its policies and legislation like Bill C-48, listens not only to members of this House but also to the energy industry across Canada, and reviews its policies in the light of the valid criticisms which have been made.

There is no need for furore in this House on subjects like energy legislation. Surely all hon. members realize and recognize that not just members of this House but all Canadians are trying to achieve the same goal. In opposing provisions like Clause 10 seeking amendments and challenging other provisions in this bill, we on this side of the House are trying to achieve one thing: we are trying to get the government to re-examine its policies, to look at the criticisms which are being made and to act upon them because we think if that action is taken, if policies are re-examined, if the proposed laws are rewritten and if a sensible approach is taken to pricing and to other aspects of the energy dispute, then the private sector, even if with the help of Petro-Canada, will get on with these projects. We will achieve energy self-sufficiency and not be involved further in debates like this, which are damaging not just to the Canadian economy but to all Canadians. They create regional conflicts which are totally unnecessary.

I will finish simply by saying; let us get on with the task. In the interests of Canada and Canadians.