

The Budget—Mr. Jamieson

I might also say that the biggest single demand is likely to be from the provinces in terms of capital formation and in terms of foreign markets. Actually, if one looks at the record over the past several years, the federal government, by and large, has managed to deal with its financial requirements within the country. The provinces, by and large, with some exceptions, have gone offshore; so therefore there is a necessity for federal-provincial consultation as well.

Just moving quickly to one or two other points in the few minutes I have left, because I do not wish to intrude on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) who, as I understand it, follows me, the last thing I want to say is with regard to the somewhat cavalier way in which some hon. members of the opposition have dismissed the whole idea or the whole effort with regard to energy conservation measures introduced in the budget and in various other ways. It is most interesting to note that over the past year or so we have established a government industry committee covering all, I think, the main sectors of industry, and some of the objectives and commitments which have been made known by industry will interest hon. members in the sense of what really can be achieved in energy conservation. For instance, the chemical industry in this country is aiming for a 17 per cent reduction in BTU's per pound of product by 1980, compared with 1972. If they achieve this, and they believe they can, this will provide savings equivalent to 11 million barrels of oil annually. I am told that that is enough to heat metropolitan Toronto for one year.

Though it may at some stage seem like a relatively minor point when we talk about energy conservation measures as contained in the budget and elsewhere, the savings are potentially very significant. For instance, the pulp and paper sector is the largest energy-consuming sector, which may surprise some hon. members. I did not realize that until I saw the figures for myself. It accounts for one-quarter of the manufacturing industry's energy consumption, and the goal of this industry, as stated by the Pulp and Paper Association and its membership, is a 12 per cent reduction in BTU's per ton of product by 1980. The saving is about the same: 11 million barrels of oil annually.

I will just mention two other sectors: cement and steel. Both sectors are intensive users of energy and have already made, and are continuing to make, substantial savings in energy use. Both industries are already acknowledged to be more energy efficient than most of their world competitors. Additional projected annual savings per ton of product in the next four or five years will amount to the equivalent of one million barrels of oil for cement, and two million barrels for steel. If we put these all together and we assume that world prices will reach \$15 per barrel by 1980—and nobody really knows that with any precision—the projected saving of \$30 million for the steel industry alone by way of conservation will aid immeasurably in keeping Canadian manufactured goods competitive on world markets.

As I said at the outset, these are just a few comments with regard to the trade picture. I am pleased to be able to report to hon. members that there is a buoyancy present now. Quite honestly, I do not understand why some hon. members opposite would discredit our enthusiasm for the improvement in the economy of the United States. Clearly,

[Mr. Jamieson.]

if you are in the selling business, and that is what we are, the health of your best customer has to be a source of joy and satisfaction, and I am glad that that is happening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: I, along with the Minister of Finance, have every confidence that the projects of the various sectors which I have outlined today will come through with a satisfying performance in 1976. It will not be as good as all of us would like, but nevertheless it will be significantly better than it was in 1975. The trend generally will also be upward for the years beyond that.

I thank hon. members very much for listening with such attention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in hearing the remarks of the minister, and I regret that he has to be away at an engagement later on. I should say that the only buoyancy any of us here has noticed is the unfailing optimism of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) in the face of the worst possible circumstances. He would have been an ideal choirmaster on the *Titanic*. We at least congratulate him on his unfailing good cheer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I found it significant that as he was concluding the minister found it necessary to comment on the comfort we can take from the health of the economy of the United States, as if that were some substitute for very serious problems we face in Canada. If credit is due for the health of the United States economy, that credit is certainly due to the government of that country. What is lamentable is that most of the gains predicted by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the immediate prospect for this country will also be attributable to the government of the United States and not to the government across the aisle.

In a parliament which has been dominated by games of pass-the-buck and pass-the-blame on the "Orion," conflicts between ministers on the question of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, desperate attempts in committee to repair legislation respecting gun controls, and a government which has for the last couple of weeks indicated that it has no higher goal than to get out of here as quickly as it can, it is easy to forget that we have a budget—and I think it is particularly easy to forget this particular budget.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I share one distinction with the Minister of Finance, who is temporarily out of the House. This is the first budget he has introduced as minister, and it is the first to which I have had the privilege of responding as Leader of the Opposition. The minister and I, of course, differ in our attitude toward our predecessors. He is at pains to ignore his predecessor, John Turner, even while he presents a budget strictly in the Turner tradition, while I am deeply aware of my privilege in following, as Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield).