

The Address—Mr. Crouse

to manage our finances or take advantage of our opportunities.

This government and the Canadian people should not look upon tidal development as an Atlantic project. It is a national project, one that should commend itself to the Canadian people as a whole. In my opinion the development of Churchill falls in Labrador and the mighty power of the Fundy should go hand in hand in lighting the North American continent. A combined power grid from both these sources would more than satisfy Canada's demands, and we would have surplus power to export to the United States.

There is no fear of saturation, for the power needs of New England and New York double every ten years. I believe one of the most important reasons for speeding up this tidal development program is the fact that nuclear and thermal power plants must be fuelled by uranium, coal, oil or gas, which are non-renewable resources. If we hope to improve the over-all standard of living of Canadians, we cannot be wasteful of any of our resources. With the rising demand for energy in our modern society, it is nothing but sheer waste to ignore this vast source of power, which could bring about a golden era of industrial development in the Atlantic provinces.

● (3:30 p.m.)

A moment ago I mentioned the Atlantic Development Board. I think it is imperative that the present Liberal government cast partisan considerations aside and make available to this board funds in relation to the magnitude of the problems with which the Atlantic provinces are faced. This board, established by a Conservative government, only started to function in April, 1963. In the past four years the board has done as much as possible within the limitations imposed upon it by the financial resources provided by the federal government. The initial conception of the board called for a substantial federal investment over a ten year period. It was hoped that this would stimulate private investment.

This is exactly what has happened in connection with Expo. We see massive capital investment by the federal government, and this in turn has encouraged investment from other countries and by private industry. This is what we had hoped would happen in the Atlantic provinces. However, when the government changed in 1963 a new act revised the original conception and only \$100 million was allotted initially to improve conditions in this vast area called the Atlantic provinces. A

[Mr. Crouse.]

further \$50 million was later voted, and a special road investment of \$30 million was added, bringing the total resources of the board to some \$180 million.

Now, what does the throne speech say about the Atlantic Development Board? This is what it says:

The government will also take special measures in particular designated areas where human resources are not adequately utilized. While efforts by the government in this regard during recent years have met with a large measure of success, they are to be made even more effective. Parliament, therefore, will be invited to broaden the scope of the area development incentive program and to provide increased funds for it. Continuing encouragement will be given to the work of the Atlantic Development Board in promoting industrial development in the Atlantic region.

This is fine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we see when we turn to this year's estimates? On page 508 of the blue book an amount of \$33 million is to be credited to the board to assist in financing programs and projects, while \$14 million will be voted as the federal share of the cost of a trunk highway program in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. This represents a total of \$47 million. It is simply not enough, Mr. Speaker.

Is there no one in the present government aware of the vast area over which these funds will be spread, or of the tremendous economic problems faced by the people of the Atlantic provinces? When we look at the funds allotted for development in the Atlantic provinces and compare them with the government's bill for housekeeping, for example, we begin to realize the lack of consideration being given to our problem. Let me point out, just for the record, that the administrative overhead for the nation's government in terms of staff and office cost was \$1 billion in 1963. However, the cost jumped to \$1,325 million last year, a whopping 30 per cent increase. What possible justification exists for this astonishing increase, nobody knows. Apparently nobody in the government is troubled by a feeling that a full explanation is owed to parliament and to the taxpayers of Canada. But when we ask for development funds in the amount of \$1 billion spread over a ten year period in order to provide self-liquidating projects in the Atlantic provinces and raise the standard of living of our people a bit closer to the national average, our request is denied and we are turned away with a pittance.

It is not my intention to criticize the board when I say that, to date, far too little has