

*Energy Supplies Emergency Act*

does not want a boom and bust economy. I think they are entitled to an answer on this matter: it is one area with which we must deal.

I wish to go for a moment into an area which I love very much but with which I am afraid I am not too familiar. Recently I had an opportunity to visit Newfoundland and to talk to the minister of mines and resources there. The other day a brief came to my desk that said, "To all Newfoundland members and to Max Saltsman". So I assume that my visit gave me some sort of honorary status in that particular ministry.

The federal government has done a very bad job in developing the resources off the east coast. I do not want to go into a recital about how little we have given the land away for, or how little we have charged for acreage rights or drilling rights. The point is that the government has not co-operated. It is not a question of whether the share should be 50-50. I do not think the people on the east coast are really arguing the jurisdictional question; they are arguing the development question. The people on the east coast see an opportunity to improve their way of life, not just based on the royalties they will get from the oil but on the time it takes to develop it.

● (1630)

They want their universities to be given the jobs instead of, let us say, the engineering being sent to some place in Texas. They want the computer work to be done in their province—and they have the people who can do it—instead of being shipped off to New York for analysis. If there is a need for experts, it may take a little longer to train the people on the east coast because their familiarity with oil is recent; but they have shown their ability to be trained and they want their people trained. They want the rigs built there.

That is the value of development, not the fact that you will pull oil or gas out of the ocean and ship it somewhere else. That is valuable also, but it is rather similar to what John Maynard Keynes told Roosevelt with regard to ending the depression. He told him about deficit financing, and Roosevelt was a great advocate of a balanced budget during the 1930s. They say that Keynes was on his way back to England and Roosevelt said to him, "Surely you have something to say to us. You have been in this country for some while. What can we do?" Keynes said, "You know those abandoned coal mines in West Virginia? If you want to get rid of the depression, get together a number of tin cans, put a one dollar bill in each tin can and put them down at the bottom of the mine. Then hire many people who will fill up the mine and hire many people to dig out those dollar bills. When they get to the dollar bills, your depression will be over". That is a half-funny story with a great amount of truth attached to it.

In some ways the development of oil, the actual process, the training and the creation of facilities that goes on in the course of finding the oil, may do more for the development of the maritimes than the finding of the oil itself. This is the point, one that the federal government has been ignoring: the federal government should arrange meetings with the people of Newfoundland and people of Nova Scotia in order to come to a resolution of this matter.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is nearly up, and if you will restrain yourself for one moment may I conclude by thanking hon. members for listening to what I have had to say. I often enjoy interjections which provide me with an opportunity to exchange a few well-chosen or ill-chosen words with other hon. members. But this is one occasion on which I wanted to lay out what I think is a very hopeful program and a great opportunity for not only resolving the energy crisis in Canada, but also resolving many of the other difficulties that have been hanging-fire, in the process of doing something significant for the cause of confederation.

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Verdun):** Mr. Speaker, my first words are to congratulate the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) for what I was going to say was an attempt to spread oil on troubled waters, but that is not an appropriate phrase at present. I might say that I hope his speech set the tone for the rest of the debate, which I think most of us want to come to an end because regardless of how we arrived at our problem, I think we all agree that there must be some system of allocation during the coming winter months to make sure that the people who need the oil we have will get priority in obtaining that oil, and not simply those of us who may have some access to the black market or some form of influence and in that way obtain priority to fuel oil to which the silent majority, particularly in the east of Canada, are entitled.

In essence, the allocation board concept is nothing more than simply to make certain that the supplies, if they have to be in short supply are allocated to the people who should have that type of priority, namely, the under-privileged, the under-employed, the people who need oil for heating, ahead of those people who want gasoline for pleasure driving.

Last night I heard a very thought-provoking speech by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay). Although I did not agree with very much that he said, I was impressed by the manner in which he delivered it and by the very reasonable tone which he adopted which indicated that he understands the House of Commons and has the ability to make a point without becoming personal, which is, I hope, one of the characteristics of a good parliamentarian.

I think that the hon. member for Waterloo, in making his speech on national unity, at the same time quite astutely tried to rectify some of the impressions that may have been left by the Premier of Saskatchewan in his statement last evening. This is the way it should be, because those of us who have been around for 13 years know that in 1960, 1961 and 1962 this problem of national unity had a different connotation. At that time we were concerned with the question which the hon. member for Waterloo treated so eloquently, namely, the matter of national unity.

My role has been rather unique in the sense that I am one of a handful—a very small handful—of English-speaking members from the province of Quebec. We found ourselves in those days in the rather unique and sometimes lonely position of defending the federal point of view in the Quebec caucus and/or the Quebec point of view in the federal caucus all in the same morning. This is not the easiest role in the world for a member of parlia-