

implications they would have. But over a period of time there will be a number of other proposals which, from a fiscal standpoint, will attempt to direct the domestic demand into energy practices and energy purchases which are of a conservationist nature rather than ones which ignore the necessity of conserving important resources.

Mr. Stanfield: Of course at this stage we have no way of knowing whether these measures now before the House would in any way be consistent with the measures the government ultimately places before the House, but since the minister's program is in a very real sense a public relations exercise, I want to ask the minister or the government House leader whether the government will set an example in eliminating some obvious signs of very conspicuous consumption of energy? And I can mention several, some of which might sound rather personal, the elimination of any one of which would be worth more than the total advertising campaign of the minister. I would simply ask someone in the government to give me the assurance, if they can, that at least the lights will be turned out in the Pearson building?

● (2130)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we have to be clear on the terms of the order adopted by the House. I must say I do not have the order in front of me now but, as I recall it, they provide for questioning only of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I know that very likely the hon. gentleman may choose to concentrate on individual examples of this. I suppose that is inevitable in the political process.

Mr. Crouse: You asked for this in your statement.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He would be doing the program, and the long range objectives of the program, and the interests of Canadians, a great disservice if he turned to petty politics.

I would say with regard to the comments made, for example, by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and by the hon. gentleman, that of course an obvious example of energy use is the Pearson building and buildings of that kind. They were designed in an era when there was less concern with the use of energy than with regard to the structural design, use of manpower and so on, in placing the light fixtures that the architect would have had in mind.

One of the factors that will be involved in the government's program is the trade-off between energy use—between full lighting, even at night as a heating measure for the building, and reducing dependence on a non-renewable resource such as heating oil or natural gas. If the hon. member would pause to reflect, it does seem to make some sense.

Mr. Stanfield: I have reflected every night as I have driven by.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If the hon. gentleman would reflect a little more deeply, if he is capable of it. In a community like the Ottawa Valley where we have con-

Energy

siderable access to hydroelectric power it makes sense to shift static energy needs such as heating into that renewable source rather than have a heavy dependence of a non-renewable resource.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, on page 20 the minister talks about tax measures. He says:

In the design of new tax measures, consideration should be given to such measures as rapid depreciation of investment in energy . . . removal of sales tax . . .

As I understand it, the criterion for conservation is to have security of supply of energy, meaning multiple energy, so that we can serve the needs of mankind now and for the future, here and throughout the world, wherever conservation is necessary. Has the minister found that the Minister of Finance and the other ministers of the government have had a change of heart in reference to the uncertainty of the climate they have created in Canada, which has discouraged exploration and development which, in conjunction with conservation would guarantee security of supply for the future, by unreasonable tax measures? In other words, is the government now contemplating and anticipating withdrawing from its position on the tax on resources, which has driven out drilling rigs? This has discouraged even the development of coal mines in Alberta. What is the new policy? Has there been any change?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could point out to the hon. gentleman that the delay in development of coal mines in Alberta is because of the specific decision of the provincial government to await environmental and other studies.

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): That is not true.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As to the taxation measures, we take the position, which I know the hon. gentleman opposes, that there should be fair distribution of revenues between two levels of government and industry. I do not expect to change the hon. gentleman's mind in that regard, but it is the government's position that the present budget provides for a fair division of revenues. My colleague has no change in mind.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister has said he does not think I will change my mind. I am sure he has met with various segments of the industry. He talked about the coal industry and I could get into an argument about that, but I would rather go on to the question of other fuel which is so important today. Has the minister not had complaints from industry, from provincial governments, and from other people not in the industry, as to the uncertainty created by the climate of federal taxation? I am not saying the provinces are above reproach, but I am asking him about the federal system of taxation which has discouraged the development and exploration which would guarantee security of supply, in conjunction with reasonable and logical conservation policies.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I am relying only on the statement of the Minister of Mines and Minerals for Alberta in this regard in pointing out that in 1974 there was a marginally smaller number of holes drilled in Alberta. In the Arctic, of course, there have been some