

piece of legislation go, and to make a serious effort instead to find alternative energy sources in this country.

● (2150)

I underline the word "serious" because I do not believe that efforts have been made. I am no expert on this, but I, in my small province, have had some experience to demonstrate this. I well recall a few years ago when an enterprising young man got into the business—a very important one in the maritimes—of wind-driven energy. He was doing a fine job. He had his farm electrified by windmobile. He was on the way to making a success of helping both himself and our energy-short province, but month after month and year after year of discussion with government officials could not persuade them to allow that man to import an essential part of his mechanism, namely, the motor. They said "No, no, no; you can buy that in Canada, and so the tariff is on". He could not buy it in Canada, but they could not be persuaded to invoke that as a case of "Class and kind not made in Canada." In other words, while one government department was saying, "We must find an alternative," other departments could not care less.

I have another example. The other day I read my check list from what we used to call the Queen's Printer—every senator gets it—and I saw there one publication called *Switching to Electricity: Canada Oil Substitution Program a Part of the National Energy Program*. I hope that none of my people in Prince Edward Island read that and take it seriously. If they switch from oil to electricity it will not be a very good move, considering what they pay—and we are not the only ones who are in that situation.

Finally, I listened the other night to the views expressed on the mega-projects—those that were not there, those that will never be, and those that might be. I heard my colleague, Senator Donahoe, ask about the Guysborough Railroad. There was to be a deferred answer to that. I guess the train was late, because I do not believe the senator ever received an answer. I thought of some mega-projects in the area, and I remembered so well, when I was a member of the Transport Committee of the House of Commons, when we were in Prince Edward Island, listening to people there referring to the value of the causeway, which had energy saving aspects as well as many important transportation ones; and before the committee got back to Ottawa, let alone compiled its report, the Prime Minister stood up and said, "That won't be built". So the committee did not go back to Prince Edward Island on that question.

Even more impressive, that even an amateur can see, is the Chignecto project. We have always talked and been frightened by these non-renewable energy resources, but tidal power is as permanent as life itself. So long as the earth and the sun and the moon endure, there will be the power; and down in Fundy it's a source that will challenge the world with its tremendous capacity and force. Some day we know it will have to be built. Montesquieu said that to govern is to foresee. Cannot we sometimes do something before we are forced to do it?

Those are the kind of suggestions that I would favour rather than sticking yet another bill sticker on the poor motorist's

[Senator Macquarrie.]

windshield, getting a few more reports, throwing another number at him, as if social security and all the rest of it was not enough. That is bureaucratic nonsense. If it were effective it would be unhelpful, and it is likely to be unhelpful and ineffective. This is one of the worst pieces of legislation we have had before us, and I hope it will be the great exercise of this noble body to cast it into the great beyond where it belongs.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tem:** Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

**Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time, on division.

#### REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government)** moved that the bill be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

### PETROLEUM INCENTIVES PROGRAM BILL CANADIAN OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL DETERMINATION BILL

#### SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. D. G. Steuart** moved the second reading of Bill C-104, respecting petroleum incentives and Canadian ownership and control determination and to amend the Foreign Investment Review Act.

He said: Honourable senators, I would cut my speech much shorter, but if I do then the people who wrote the speech would probably crucify me. Twenty years ago I was a member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, and if anyone had suggested that one day I would sponsor a bill such as Bill C-104, I would not have believed them. I was convinced at that time that the only thing wrong with American investment was that we did not have enough of it. I am still convinced that we need outside capital, but that also we need more control of some of our basic industries.

In Saskatchewan at that time we had tried to interest Canadian capital to come into the province to help us develop our resources, and we were largely ignored. We turned to the United States, and they came to our province and developed our timber, potash and oil resources. It was, in fact, a mixed blessing. This largely foreign investment produced badly needed jobs and tax revenues, and while markets were strong we all prospered. A few years later a down-turn in world demand for our resources exposed the other side of the foreign investment coin. To a very large extent we lost control of our own resources. I will briefly outline what happened to the Saskatchewan potash industry, in order to illustrate my point, although the same thing happened in the case of other resources.