

Mr. Bouchard: Well, I see there being two types of changes required. The first, which are the least difficult to effect, because none of this will be easy, and which seem the most logical, would be strict energy conservation measures. This is something we must tackle head-on.

The second type would be even more radical measures under substantial new energy programs. You are absolutely right: the energy sector is certainly one of the areas where we will have to work with tremendous vigour. We are all aware of the political problems that this is likely to cause for Canada as a whole. We are also all aware that we will have to be fair in the process. Certain regions of the country are linked with specific forms of energy, as we all know. There are also local economies that might be directly affected by ill-considered action on our part. So, in the second stage of our two-pronged attack, when it comes time to take steps that involve the substance of our energy policies, we will have to be both fair and innovative. I see such initiatives also having a tax component.

Mr. Fulton: I think a lot of Canadians were alarmed in the last few days to hear the Minister of Energy suggesting that to realistically meet new air pollution target standards we would have to stop using motor vehicles in the major cities in Canada. We heard from expert witnesses today and yesterday, for example, that Great Britain could save 140 million pounds, about a quarter of a billion dollars Canadian, going to energy efficiency and conservation. Germany is going to reduce greenhouse emissions by 25% and make money doing it. Sweden is going to do the same thing.

Why is it that neither your ministry nor the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources have taken the time to evaluate the DPA study, which is the Canadian contemporary of the British study, the Swedish study and many other studies that have been done, which indicate, through energy efficiency and conservation for Canada, we can reduce the amount of carbon dioxide released by two-thirds and at the same time save every man, woman, and child in Canada \$5,000? As I said earlier today, it seems to me that nothing could be more popular for a government than saying they are going to save us each \$5,000 and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, at least of carbon dioxide, by two-thirds.

Why is it that neither Environment Canada nor Energy, Mines and Resources have ever done an evaluation or ever publically stated why this report was rejected, when it seems to be the route that most other countries in the world are going who are taking global warming seriously? If you can reduce greenhouse gas and save money for the consumer, is that not really what we should be talking about, instead of making statements? Frankly, Minister, I know you personally well enough to know that you know that the statement that we would have to stop using cars in all of Canada's major cities is false. It is an unfortunate kind of approach for any minister of the Crown to take to an issue that is so serious.

Mr. Bouchard: There are many questions in this. My honourable colleague has a way of meshing all kinds of questions into the same question. It is as if the NDP has a ratio of three questions against one for the other parties.