

will supply between 20 and 25 per cent of total provincial needs.

Clearly, we should do everything in our power to make sure that the uranium industry remains under Canadian ownership and protection. In any event I am pleased to see the shift away from petroleum to uranium as a source of energy. The use of such clean energy surely will meet most of the objections of the environmentalists and conservationists. More important, energy generated this way is practically inflation proof.

Speaking as a Canadian, I would not be comfortable in thinking that our uranium industry might pass into foreign hands. I know that there is a large element of foreign investment in our uranium industry. I would not willingly accept our uranium industry passing into the hands of multi-national petroleum companies. Such control would challenge the economic independence of Canada. We simply cannot allow it. It seems to me that if those holding an interest in the uranium industry wish to sell their interest, the government should be the buyer. We should buy those facilities. So important is uranium, that it ought to be considered as a public utility. I would be prepared to go even further and have some agency of government, perhaps the Canadian Development Corporation or some similar agency, granted terms of reference which would allow it to engage actively in uranium exploration. The government ought to be involved in that area.

I was pleased to see the government's intention to establish Petro-Canada expressed in the Speech from the Throne. I want the government to proceed with this immediately. It should give this Crown corporation a mandate which will allow it to operate effectively as a significant factor in the energy field. I want the corporation to be involved in the exploration for petroleum, in the proving up, in basic refining, and perhaps involved in the manufacture and selling of petroleum derivatives, although that role may not have been envisaged for Petro-Canada.

When we talk of inflation we naturally talk of items which have increased very greatly in price. I am thinking of fertilizer, clothing and so on. There is always one factor that is common to all such items: they are all petroleum based, or made from petroleum derivatives. It seems to me that if we are concerned about profiteering, we might look at the marketing practices of petroleum companies. Here I am thinking of the marketing of petroleum derivatives. That might be the logical area for Petro-Canada to be involved in. Contrary to what many suggest, I do not see Petro-Canada being involved in the retail end of the business.

The people now retailing petroleum products are among the most efficient operators in our economy and I do not think the government should compete with them. Surely we could give Petro-Canada, or an agency like it, a mandate strong enough to enable it to make its presence felt in the petroleum business, particularly in the Canadian far north where the federal government has jurisdiction under the constitution.

I should like to see Petro-Canada being given another role as well. We should consider allowing Petro-Canada to be involved in marketing. If it is necessary for us, for the sake of eastern Canada, to enter into long term commitments with, say, Venezuela or any of the multinational

*The Address—Mr. Milne*

petroleum producers, I think Petro-Canada would be the logical agency of government to do so on behalf of all Canadians.

May I introduce another thought about energy, a thought which has not been given as wide a presentation as it deserves. I am talking about the efficient utilization of energy. It seems to me, when we talk of energy use in Canada, that we are talking about a three part equation; the availability of energy, the price of energy and the distribution of energy. I think Canada probably has available more energy per capita than any other country in the world. We are not concerned so much about energy shortages as about using up very low priced energy currently available to us. Traditionally, our energy has been cheap. Probably less than 3 per cent of the cost of production is tied up in energy, and about 5 per cent of disposable income is spent on it. We have never thought very much about how we can use energy most efficiently.

Let me put forward this thesis. Every percentage point by which we increase the efficiency of our use of energy will mean that that much more energy will remain available to us at a lower price. I am not saying that we need to run out of energy. Increasing its efficient use will make available more energy at a lower price for home and industry. Consider all the energy now being used in Canada for transportation and other purposes. At present we are converting to energy only about 40 per cent of the resource we take from the ground. Surely we can use our engineering and design expertise to create equipment which will do a better job than existing equipment. I like to think that we can create equipment which will do the same job but use 25 per cent less energy.

Certain parts of the world, including the United States, have become concerned about energy shortages. Governments have tried to instil what I call a conservation ethic into their people. Governments want people to adopt a fundamentally changed lifestyle and use less energy. So far most of these programs have failed. It seems to me we need, through better engineering and design, to create better equipment. With superior engineering we can still retain our present standard of living, protect the environment, and retain the current productivity of industry, even though we use less energy.

I suggest that there is a definite role for the federal government in this field. The minister, whom I observed last night on television, said that something must be done to conserve petroleum. I submit that the efficiency with which we use it is equally important. It is not so much that industry does not respond to a conservation program; mainly it is a case of good equipment which will save energy not being available.

As I say, we can save a great deal with improved design. Has anyone stopped to think of the tremendous amount of energy which goes through a ventilation system and is expended, and of the energy which is lost through waste water? This heat, which is a form of energy, could be reclaimed.

I think the government should provide leadership and encourage good design. The tax structure should encourage the installation of more efficient equipment. This should be made more attractive.