

the spinoffs that will come from the purchase by utilities and their suppliers of required raw and refined material.

We have been trying to make the point throughout this grand debate on energy security that the government should emphasize conservation and alternate energy much more than it has. For example, the government is spending \$6.5 billion on PIP grants to private industry. It is spending \$35 million to upgrade its alternate energy corporation, Canertech. There is a tremendous gap between what the government is prepared to pay on the supply side and what it is prepared to do on the demand side to reduce the demand for this resource. What the passage I quoted made me realize is that there are many more jobs—and this is an issue we really must debate further in the House of Commons—in connection with conversion from oil to gas and other alternate methods of heating, the insulation of people's houses, the provision of rapid transit, conservation and so forth.

Instead, what we have talked about almost every day in this House when we—and the press as well—have talked about energy is that Alsands should go ahead at a cost of \$13 billion, Cold Lake should go ahead at a cost of \$10 billion and the Alaska highway pipeline should go ahead at a cost of \$40 billion. We talk about these megaprojects and jobs on these megaprojects, but if we really analyse the situation, we see that there are many more jobs in projects of smaller scale, including conservation and alternatives. That is something which has never really been debated enough in this House.

The hon. member who spoke previously mentioned the report of the all-party committee on energy alternatives. It was a fine report but it was simply ignored by the government. I think we will have to debate that in the committee.

I want to state again very briefly our position on this matter. The monitoring agency which is the heart of this bill is really a paper tiger. It monitors, collects statistics and looks around, but it has no teeth when it comes to being able to roll back prices if there are rip-offs. The hon. member for Comox-Powell River will speak about what is happening in relation to combines legislation and in relation to prices.

This monitoring agency is like a person wearing a blindfold. It hears no evil and speaks no evil; it just reports. That is not good enough. We want a monitoring agency we would call COPP, a commission on oil pricing and profits. We felt the name "COPP" would convey to people what it would do; it would have some real teeth and real power not only to monitor but also to take decisive action if decisive action was required.

I will conclude by saying what I said in opening my speech. I have learned that the motto of the Liberal government is quite clear: do not do anything by halves if you can do it by quarters. If you can give an agency teeth, do not do it. If you have a Bertrand report, just shuffle it off. If you have problems with oil company profits, just set up a monitoring agency. If you have problems with northern energy, just study it, monitor it, look at it, shuffle it and put it off, but never act. That is the position of this government, and that is why we in the New Democratic Party oppose this bill.

Energy Monitoring Act

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby)—Energy—Nova Scotia offshore development. (b) Measures to assist development; the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman)—External Affairs—Plight of Nicaraguan refugees in Honduras. (b) Request for human rights investigation; the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin)—Energy—Inquiry whether representations will be made to Quebec to reduce impact of gasoline retailers' strike.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ENERGY MONITORING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH PETROLEUM MONITORING AGENCY
AND TO AMEND CERTAIN ACTS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-106, respecting energy monitoring and to amend the Energy Supplies Emergency Act, 1979 and the Oil Substitution and Conservation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Energy Legislation.

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, my purpose in participating in this debate at second reading of Bill C-106, which relates to energy monitoring, supply and conservation, is to underline the special interest and concern of Atlantic Canada and those areas of eastern Quebec which do not now have access to Canadian oil and gas supplies.

It is quite obvious to residents and governments in Newfoundland, the maritimes and Quebec that we have both a special problem and a clear vulnerability with respect to energy supplies. This special status is reflected in the cost, in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, of electrical energy. The consumers in those provinces pay the highest electric energy costs in Canada. It is the hope and aim of the government of the province of Nova Scotia, for example, that energy costs can be kept at a level equal to the average across Canada and, in trying to carry out that aim, the government of Nova Scotia has experienced cost-deficits in the area of \$100 million just to maintain electric energy supplies to consumers at a cost equal to the average enjoyed by other Canadians. It is a very difficult and very serious problem on the east coast of Canada and in the province of Quebec, brought on by the lack of access to Canadian supplies. We view the matter of energy