

They have more acid rain problems than we do and therefore the option of building more fossil fuels plants is not open to them. So they are forced back into seeing how ingenious they can actually manage to be on conservation. In fact, they have been extremely ingenious within the constraints of the market mechanism.

So I think what we are talking about now is a major shift in the attitudes of those people who run what has traditionally been perhaps the most important industry in Canada—the energy industry—away from necessarily talking supply and talking more about how you meet the perceived needs of the Canadian public and of our foreign customers. That is not an easy shift. I think what we are seeing now are the sort of fits and starts that one goes through as one begins to make that shift.

I have no explanation for why Mr. Epp and Mr. Bouchard have apparently done what you have suggested they have done. Perhaps we can ask the minister when he comes.

All I was trying to do, by illustrating these other examples in my presentation, was to point out the fact that a number of countries have taken perfectly respectable, good, grey economic modellers and turned them loose with their energy sectors. As a result they have produced scenarios which seem to be quite plausible, some of which have actually been enacted by legislatures. They are resulting in significant energy savings, significant reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, and actually monetary savings to the people who actually buy and use energy.

Now, I am sure Canada is different from other countries. Every country has a different energy mix. Every country has different problems of geography. Every country has different mixes of industry, and we have a very high amount of primary industry, which is very energy intensive. I still do not believe all of these other studies could be going on, yielding up the kinds of results they appear to be yielding, while Canada at the same time is at a stage where we keep saying we cannot afford to do anything about target-setting in the carbon dioxide emissions business.

.1140

One of the reasons I suggested the possibility of some sort of quasi-independent body in this area is that I sense from what Mr. Miller was saying the other day and from remarks I have had from friends of mine in western Canada, for instance, that there is very little public trust in the energy policy-making process in this country because it is not sufficiently transparent. It may in fact be excellent. It may be based on absolutely first-rate information. But it is not transparent to the public what is actually happening in terms of setting targets.

**Mrs. Catterall:** I think it is evident to all of us that our greatest new source of energy is not nuclear power or new coal-fired generating stations but conservation. Saturday I heard on CBC a description that the energy-efficiency savings possible in Montreal alone are equivalent to one full James Bay project or all the oil in the Middle East. I think that is where we clearly need to be focusing our energy.