

sufficient economic forethought, if you like, given to the planning of the use of our resources and energy resources in particular. That may well be a valid criticism of the past. I think the emphasis in the past with regard to the development of our mineral resources, our energy resources and our non-renewable resources generally, was to develop them and to find markets for them. I believe that until fairly recently that was pretty well what we were concerned with; that is, the economic growth, if you like, as applied to these resources as well as others.

I think it is very clear, not merely from the well understood indications that were shown in the debate here but from the debate generally in the country and in the world, that the importance of resources, and mineral resources in particular as well as non-renewable resources generally in the future, may be much greater than we had appreciated in the past. The equation may be put as simply as this. In a world that will double in population in the next 30 or 35 years, as the prognosticators indicate, in a world in which it took from the beginning of time to put some 3.5 billion people on earth, we will put that many more people on earth in perhaps 30 or 35 years. The population of the world expects what we have deemed to be a high standard of living. Even in the third world, the undeveloped world where the standard of living is so deplorable, the people, I believe probably more than others, want their standard of living to grow and expand. That inevitably means that the finite resources, energy and mineral, will be that much more important and valuable.

Under such circumstances I believe it is quite clear that possibly there needs to be a new emphasis in a country such as Canada, which is so rich in these resources, on the economic planning of the use of these resources, first for domestic purposes because Canadian interests must be paramount, and secondly for use in respect of Canada's position in the world in the years ahead. So, certainly there will be this new emphasis in a department whose main function to date has been the encouragement of development rather than economic planning in respect of the use of the resources. I think probably the old department of mines and technical surveys exemplified the philosophy that lay behind our energy and resource development people when they provided the infrastructure, if you like, scientific and technological, for development. The scientific services were there. The geological surveys were made and that information was available to the world at large. We said, here is the information with which you can look for minerals in the most likely areas. That was probably the main, if not the sole, function of the department.

Certainly, while I say there are no new powers envisaged within the bill, I cannot deny the connotations in the speeches of so many members that a new emphasis is required. I believe this is clearly understood, even though no new specific powers are envisaged in the bill. I think the demarcation in respect of emphasis on environment and renewable resources in one department, as opposed to the emphasis on non-renewable resources in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, clearly

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

indicates that the government appreciates that these two are affected in some way parallel in this country and in the kind of world in which we find ourselves today.

I do not believe I can today answer all the very valid questions asked by many members during the course of the debate so far, but I shall do my best at least to give a general review of what has taken place to date. First, I think the main concern has been in respect of energy policies rather than mineral policies, if I understood the tenor of the debate. At the outset, I may say there is no such thing as a static and continuing or constant energy policy. I do not think I could ever, no matter how effective and complete our research and planning should be, stand up in this House and say that here is the energy policy for Canada. We should then forget about it, because it is there for the next few years and we could turn our attention in this House to something else. Energy policy does not lend itself to that kind of definitive, lasting solution.

I might illustrate this best in this way. Let us say we attempted to have this sort of a complete and comprehensive over-all policy and then next week, as might well be the case, a new situation should arise. Suppose the rumour was proven true that there had been a great find of oil on the east coast, and we announced an over-all energy policy that did not take such a find into consideration. Quite obviously, we would have to rush out and revise our energy policy. That is why I say that the energy policy generally is fluid and changing, and must be so if we are to use our energy resources and meet the demands in the best interests of the total economy. In our thinking on the energy policy and where the policies of the government must go if we are to have the most effective direction in the national interest, I think it is most useful—and this is the way we have taken in the department and with the agencies that report to me—to think rather of policy objectives. What are the objectives of the use of energy in Canada? In this regard, we can classify some of those objectives.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The economic objective is one of them, to make the best economic use of our resources. National security is very clearly one of the objectives of our energy policy, because no modern industrial state such as Canada can be founded on anything but the most secure sources of supply that it can achieve, bearing in mind that these objectives have to be related one to the other. We would not want complete security at the price of economic foolhardiness. If we had complete security at too high a price for energy that the consumers of Canada, both industrial and household, paid, then we would have paid too high a price for security. Again these varying objectives have to be related.

Another objective is resource adequacy. That is certainly one of the great problems. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, assuring the adequacy of our resources has been, until fairly recently, our paramount objective. The quality of the environment is a fairly new objective. Until a very few years ago most of us did not foresee—and I certainly was not among the wise who