

plug into cheaper hydro power. Also coal mine development and thermal projects might have been accelerated, but the governments argued and a stalemate resulted.

Ex-premier Regan watched expectantly and forlornly for offshore oil discoveries but nothing worthwhile was found. As so often happens, the pie did not fall from the sky and offshore oil did not materialize. It is interesting to note that Petro-Can has jumped into offshore exploration and is apparently rekindling the dream of offshore oil finds. Let us hope it does not become a financial nightmare for Canadians. Now there is a new government in Nova Scotia. It is a more co-operative one, one that has some insight into the energy situation.

We may have reached a new period in the energy history of the maritimes because we now have an energy agreement between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in which the federal government is participating. As well we have the Maritime Energy Corporation which involves these three provinces and the federal government. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, who the chief critic is of this provincial-federal co-operation, this new Maritime Energy Corporation? It is none other than the minister's old political friend, the ex-premier of Nova Scotia. He says the energy agreement forces Nova Scotia to assume the mistakes of New Brunswick and the federal government in nuclear energy. He says: "Don't extend the pipeline eastward; it will interfere with coal development." I say the minister better straighten him out.

Coal is now more competitive with the cost of oil approaching a price of \$20 a barrel. If coal is viable as a source of energy it means a labour intensive industry which is not subject to foreign control. If the minister wants a national energy company he should promote the Cape Breton Development Corporation as "Coal-Can" and pour some of the billions of dollars being used to buy shares in viable private oil companies into coal development.

I have mentioned coal and I should underline the fact that the solution to the world oil crisis and the national oil emergency contemplated by this bill is the establishment of alternative sources of energy. What is meant by that? First, as I have mentioned, there is coal. In the maritimes we have one of the most fantastic potentials, namely Fundy tidal power. Hydro development in Newfoundland and Labrador is also a possibility, but we will have to have the transmission lines in place to carry whatever power is generated through a hydro system. Gas is another possibility the minister has mentioned many times in the House but there is an indication that gas brought to the east coast would cost twice as much as the gas utilized in places such as Toronto.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me deliver this message to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. As always, the real answer is: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. In energy terms, ounces of money spent on alternative energy sources will yield pounds of savings in dollars which would otherwise be spent on foreign oil.

### *Energy Supplies*

● (1610)

[Translation]

**Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax—East Hants (Mr. Crosby) drew earlier an analogy between the Pope's legions and the powers of Petro-Canada or the services it might offer. I remember it was Stalin who asked: "How many legions does the Pope have?" It was an attempt to ignore the importance of the Pope in the world. I think his analogy was ill-chosen because everybody knows that even if the Pope has no army he has considerable influence over the whole of humanity. It is demonstrated by the fact that all countries in the world have representatives in Rome to benefit from his services and extensive knowledge.

If Petro-Canada still has no pipeline, liquefied gas tanker or oil resources, obviously it is a tool that the government wants to have at its disposal to ensure a better distribution of our resources and wealth. Had it been left to the party represented by the hon. member, Petro-Canada would never have seen the light. I also noticed that the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) referred continually to provincial powers over resources.

Rather than launching a debate between the powers of the central government and those of the provinces, I would prefer to consider the interest of the individual, wherever he is living, and his right to equal opportunities and to his fair share of our wealth and resources. If we consider the interest of the individual, we have to conclude that no one would dispute the need for equalization, social measures like family allowances, old age security and others, and the need to share our wealth on some basis.

If we consider this principle from the individual point of view, I do not see why we should not reach the same conclusion when it comes to sharing our vast country's resources. Everybody knows that the individual as such does not necessarily trip over constitutional commas. If he were to freeze in the dark, he would not care if it was under federal or provincial jurisdiction, but would rather ask the governments to act. And I must commend the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) and his parliamentary secretary. I think they did a wonderful job in promoting this aspect. However, I am shocked that measures which for all practical purposes seem rather timid to me should give rise to such long debates and so many objections. So what is it all about? The idea is to make sure that the Canadian who lives in the east can afford as much heating and as many other services as the one who lives in the west. I think both would benefit. Nobody is questioning the general policy the government has come up with in order to ensure our self-sufficiency. It is of the utmost importance, and step by step we will put into place everything we need to succeed. We have here two opposing concepts. Some say we should leave it to private enterprise to reach that goal. Fine. I for one do not belittle the usefulness of private