

*Energy*

secretary, or the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, could answer it.

On page 20 of this statement, which renders such a great disservice to the conservation ethic, we have an indication that standards will be established which will impose "a minimum miles per gallon standard that would rise with time", regarding automobiles.

I note that the Minister of the Environment has come in. I will repeat for the minister's information the suggestion on page 20 of the statement made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, that one of the changes would be the introduction of standards regarding automobile performance which would introduce "a minimum miles per gallon standard that would rise with time."

I ask the Minister of the Environment whether that means that the government is actively considering the removal of pollution control devices from automobiles and, if that is the case, was she consulted on the statement of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and when will we have a statement of that policy in the House?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the arrangement made was with regard to questioning me, and I would be glad to respond to the hon. gentleman's question. Of course his question puts the finger on a rather difficult trade-off which we have—that a non renewable resource, petroleum, which is the principal source for locomotion in the country, if used under some of the lead removal standards, for example with regard to pollution control, would involve a very much higher use of petroleum even though it may bring about a substantial change in the environmental standards. It was, of course, because we felt that the situation is different in Canada that we have not followed the lead of the United States in this regard, and we have a different set of standards.

This really represents the difficult trade-off we have in regard to being more economical in the use of a scarce resource and, at the same time, our concern with regard to the use of a locomotion technique that itself is polluting.

I think I would have to say that in the longer run the obvious solution to this matter is to shift more of the personal transportation away from individual automobiles and on to mass transit, particularly mass transit which runs on the basis of electricity rather than internal combustion engines.

**Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):** In his answer the minister neglected to answer my question. Would he tell us what is going to be the future of pollution control devices on automobiles in the short term in this country? At the same time would the minister give us an indication whether, in preparing this so-called statement tonight, there has been thorough discussion with the Minister of the Environment so that what he is intimating here is in fact government policy as followed by that department?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I have of course answered his question. Naturally it is government policy.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that as I ask my question the

[Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain).]

minister will appreciate the desire of my family to cooperate with any measure to conserve energy.

**Mr. Hees:** Watch Stanfields go!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I was puzzled when I heard the argument as to how this statement could possibly affect the market. I do not think it will even affect the market for underwear, but I would like to ask the minister in all seriousness whether he can give us any explanation as to why this statement of a very general nature has been delayed until tonight? It has been delayed for some two years until well into the winter of 1974/75. Has the minister any possible justification for his apparent tardiness, and I would have to say negligence, in presenting this statement after such a long delay?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, the Office of Energy Conservation was formed just about this time last year, and the officers of that office have engaged in an extensive consultation with regard to both the provinces and other interested persons in the energy and conservation field. I suppose if we had had very many more people and a much larger bureaucracy engaged in the operation, we could have proceeded more quickly. I do not pretend to be happy about the rate of progress, but I hope that we might have the support, and perhaps a great indication of support, from the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. Joking aside, it is a very important resource conservation program for Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, taking up the serious vein which the minister has struck, I would like to ask him or the government House leader whether it is possible to tell us why the government proceeded with what I think one might call the half baked conservation related tax measures, included in the budget, while the government has not presented a comprehensive fiscal policy relating to this problem?

I also ask whether the government is going to insist on proceeding with the tax measures relating to conservation which it has introduced and which have now reached the third reading stage, bearing as they do in a very inequitable fashion upon some Canadians and some sectors of the economy, or whether the government is going to introduce a comprehensive fiscal approach to this problem, and not proceed further in this half baked approach which has been proceeded with to date.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is a matter of opinion as to whether it is desirable to try to reduce by fiscal measures the luxury use of some vehicles, as I am not sure which measures the hon. gentleman has specifically in mind, but with regard to vehicles and some very large power units for boats, particularly for pleasure purposes, it seems to me that this is perfectly consistent with the program set out this evening, and it is an obviously intelligent thing to do.

I made some reference to other fiscal measures which I would, of course, recommend to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and which he will have to consider before his next budgetary presentation with regard to all the