

people who tell us what sources of oil there are in Canada and what allocations need to be made?

We have encountered a situation in which prices are rising. There is an apprehended possibility of a crude petroleum shortfall ranging from a high of 200,000 barrels a day to a low of between 10,000 and 15,000 barrels. It has become evident during the past few weeks that the 200,000 barrel shortfall is an upward limit; it is not a realistic figure or one we can anticipate realistically. The low figure seems much more reliable. Is this the type of emergency, uncertain as it is, which should move this House to give such sweeping powers to a five-man board, powers to supersede any law which might conceivably interfere with their discretionary powers? Is that sufficient reason for this House to vote confidence in the governor in council and in its five picked men who will control and, in effect, administer industries using petroleum, petrochemicals, plastics and coal? Perhaps Nova Scotia will lose its right to sell coal to the highest bidder, just as Alberta and other producing provinces will perhaps lose their right to direct the sales of petroleum.

The board would also control electricity. Perhaps development of Fundy tidal power and allocations of other forms of power would come under the board. More important, for that matter, the board would have power to override provincial constitutions and provincial interests. Mr. Speaker, this board would have power to enrich one company at the expense of another, one province at the expense of another. It would have power to override federal and provincial environmental laws and other federal statutes passed by this House. It would have power to do this under regulation passed by the governor in council.

That is not the worst of it. The legislation is open-ended; it will remain in force as long as the governor in council chooses to continue the program. Do we need this program, Mr. Speaker? Is the government entitled to ask for it at this stage of the game? My answer is no. The government is not concerned about international prices, because if it were it would have embarked upon a program of alternative sources of energy to replace petroleum, before petroleum runs out. We are looking at an expenditure of \$40 million to be used in research and development of tar sands. Where is the research and development of solar energy, on hydrogen energy and other energy forms? The United States is setting aside \$600 million for research and development with regard to solar energy. That is how important they think the petroleum crisis is.

This government thinks the present petroleum crisis is serious enough, true, and it wants to take short-term measures to increase supplies of forms of energy now being used. However, there are no measures before this House, and none have been suggested, for increasing the production of petroleum in Canada. The only measures put before us so far have to do with the allocation of existing oil supplies. Government planning and foresight is restricted to this winter and to making sure that Canadians have enough heat this winter. What has been said so far in this debate, I suggest, bears me out. The government's major concern is to make sure that Canadians have enough energy to heat their homes through the winter. It wants to make sure it retains the support of the

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

NDP during the current heating season, if I may use a phrase used last week in a public pronouncement.

I have not heard of any programs, either in place or anticipated, relating to uses of other forms of energy such as solar or wind energy which might be used to boost our electrical supplies. I have not heard of the development of technology for the harnessing of hydrogen energy, solar energy or a combination of solar and hydrogen energy. Canadians have a right to expect the federal government to be involved in these areas and to look to the future in order to protect us against some future energy crisis. The present crisis is one simply of rising prices. That, essentially, is the crisis we face in Canada. What will happen when the crisis becomes one of lack of supply? We will not be able to replace our supplies through the use of short-term, ad hoc measures which we have become so used to seeing brought forward in this House.

● (1550)

I shall conclude by quoting extensively from an editorial which appeared in the *Chronicle-Herald*. In large measure it sums up the attitude which is natural to an easterner in the situation facing this House and this country and the manner in which the government has seen fit to deal with it. The editorial deals with the national oil policy brought forward last week by the Prime Minister. It reads:

Is it good "national" policy to offer firm price-freeze protection to consumers in the central and western regions but, at the same time, to hold out only "hope for the best" wishes for those in the east?

Does it help promote the cause of national unity for the government to tell the people in two-thirds of the country not to worry about price hikes any more this winter, but to offer no similar safeguard to the rest of us who live in the east where the price crisis is more severe?

Does it really mean very much to promise "early construction" of an extension to Montreal of the trans-Canada pipeline system—which travels only a fraction of the breadth of the country—at a time when there is a world shortage of pipe?

Will the proposed national energy corporation be able to do very much by way of playing its promised "significant role" in exploration for new oil—including that locked beneath the water off the east coast, and the Alberta tar sands, and the Arctic ice mass—with a penny-ante budget of only \$8 million in each of the next five years?

What has emerged as Ottawa's answer to the energy crisis is a paste-up, patchwork piece of abstract with indefinite and undefined lines of approach, instead of a clear, readable, realistic blueprint to make Canada self-sufficient in energy production and delivery.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) said, Bill C-236 is a gigantic intrusion into the life of Canadians. We have to recognize this for what it is. It gives the government tremendous powers of allocation, pricing and distribution. As someone said, it is the War Measures Act on economics or the War Measures Act on energy. The question we have to ask ourselves when giving a government this power is not whether somebody should have this power, because somebody already has it; it is whether we would prefer the government of Canada to have this power or to have it wielded, as in the past, by the multinational corporations of the world.