

only mean that it is opposed to the goals. Certainly, that puts the Government at variance with almost everyone in the country.

Another aspect is the employment which these programs create. They not only meet an energy-saving need, but they are effective in job creation. As my colleague indicated earlier, the unemployment rate in Vancouver in the construction industry is 60 to 70 per cent, as it is in Windsor. These programs would produce jobs in the construction industry. They are labour-intensive programs. A lot of emphasis has been placed on the prospect of job creation in the oil industry and the atomic energy industry. If one looks at the oil industry, 18.9 person-years of work are produced for every million dollar expenditure. In the atomic energy field, 24 person-years of work are created for every million dollar expenditure. But almost 36 person-years of work are created for every million dollar expenditure in the conservation of energy. In fact, the number of jobs which have been created through CHIP has been superior to any of the figures which I have mentioned. In fact, through CHIP, 108 person-years of work are created for every million dollars of government expenditure. With the demise of CHIP, 30,000 person-years of work will be lost.

With respect to COSP, 50 person-years of work are created for every million dollars which is spent. Between 1981 and 1985, 50,000 jobs were created. With the termination of the Canadian Oil Substitution Program, 59,000 person-years of work will be lost.

It is difficult to determine whether the Government has given any thought to the proposal which is before the House, that is to say, any thought beyond the ideological premise. When attempting to test the validity of a piece of legislation, one must hunt for a basic premise which is founded in reason, which has some logic and which has an element of common sense. But when a Government proposes an action which does not recognize that the ground is frozen in the winter in northern Canada, I believe that calls into question the thought which went into this legislation.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this legislation which relates to the Canadian Home Insulation Program and the Canadian Oil Substitution Program. It strikes me that the motion to hoist Bill C-24 for six months is intelligent and one which would be greeted with a great deal of respect by Canadians. All Governments are entitled to an error in judgment. I consider this legislation to be a serious error in judgment.

In my city, the housing stock is very old and all kinds of government incentives are required, particularly in this time of decreasing income and increasing costs. Therefore, I strongly urge the Government to reconsider the Bill. Perhaps the Government should put it aside until a time when it can bring forward a more comprehensive program. In any case it should stop dealing with these issues by way of a piecemeal approach.

The Government made 38 energy promises during the election campaign. I believe that many of those promises were stated with good will, but they were stated in a glib way and

were not fully thought out. I would ask the Government seriously to consider withdrawing this Bill. It should take the six months to consider the legislation carefully. Then it could come back with something which would make sense to the people in my riding as well as people in Montreal, Quebec City and those areas of the country where there is a lot of old housing stock.

Most families with two incomes are having a difficult time. Most families require two incomes. It is not a matter of both people wanting to work or wanting to express their creativity, but rather a matter of their having to work because they need the extra income. Any programs which will enable families to reduce their overhead costs, enable them to save money, and at the same time conserve energy, are valuable programs.

With respect to meeting government goals on job creation, what better programs could be used than CHIP or COSP? These programs provide an opportunity for manufacturers to produce new goods such as furnaces, and they also provide opportunities for the service sector to insulate attics etcetera. It creates jobs in the business and service sectors. In addition, families will be able to manage their budgets much more effectively.

It is a serious issue in a country which has a cold climate for almost six months of the year. Many northern parts of Canada cannot become involved in these programs, except for short periods in summer, because of climatic conditions. In converting to alternative resources and in using, particularly in Quebec, hydroelectric power or wood and gas, we will conserve approximately 65,000 barrels of oil per day. That is a very significant saving of a non-renewable resource. If we are serious about conservation, we must look at the subject in a comprehensive way.

A Member opposite referred to the fact that these programs were used only by the wealthy. That is not the case. As the previous speaker indicated, the programs have been used by many low-income families. Even when they are used by wealthy people, they are a taxable benefit. I understand that \$1.3 million has been spent on home insulation and off-oil programs, but the Government has recovered over \$300 million. I do not think that because these programs have been used by upper-income people they should be terminated. They have been a very important service to middle and low-income people as well.

• (1540)

By the way, regarding that 65,000 barrels of oil a day which has been saved, I believe there was an update by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources increasing that to 75,000 barrels a day. That saving of oil must be a very significant factor, particularly to the Party in opposition, and I am speaking about opposition across the floor to my philosophy.

So I recommend very strongly that the Government support the hoist motion, keep this Bill off the books for six months, go back to the drawing board and bring back a comprehensive plan which will deal with alternative energy, something that