

Energy Supplies

They do not agree, Mr. Speaker, to say that windows are not insulation, but we are prepared to give subsidies to those companies which make such windows. I do not understand at all the attitude of the department which is responsible for the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

I further quote:

In that document, it is recognized that a maximum 0.50 p.c.m. rate of air infiltration per foot can be tolerated, because it is generally admitted that any house requires a minimum of ½ air change every hour for the needs of ventilation (replacement of air) and relative humidity control (condensation). If all the windows were perfectly airtight it would no doubt be necessary to ensure this ventilation by mechanical means, probably less effective from a performance standpoint, as well as cost effectiveness.

I trust those few comments will be of use to you.

Yours truly,
Jacques Soucy, P.Eng.,
Support Centre,
Quebec Regional Office
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Mr. Speaker, speaking of the bill before us, the minister says we must above all save energy; so why is it that the same minister or his colleagues are not in favour of trying out those windows, manufactured here in Canada, so that we might at least find out if they really can help conserve energy efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, of course we of the opposition are rather at a disadvantage, as I said before, to prevent passage of this bill; yet I should like to express a wish. Since 1974, when I was elected to this House, we have passed many bills; but after they are adopted and have been given assent by the Senate, civil servants come along with regulations. So, the wish I express on behalf of my colleagues of the Social Credit Party of Canada is that the minister, after this bill is passed and before applying regulations, should come back before a standing committee to give us a chance to look into the possibilities, to the best of our ability, of ensuring that this bill is welcomed by the people.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say that I trust the minister will understand my message, and that those companies will invest, not through government subsidies but by saving their well earned pennies, huge sums of money in an effort to save energy as the minister would have us do today.

● (1610)

[English]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) explained the provisions of the bill before us and described the international circumstances which made it necessary for the government to proceed with precautionary measures to assure energy security.

The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) claimed that the Minister of Energy, Mines and

Resources had failed to recognize the seriousness of the energy situation. As I listened to the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham, I was struck by how unjustified that charge against the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was, because very early in the game the minister acknowledged in the House of Commons the serious situation which prevailed as a result of the cessation of production in Iran. In fact, the minister was acknowledging, as a result of inquiries by hon. members on the government side, that this situation posed a serious threat before the matter became a subject of lively questioning on the part of members of the official opposition. If the hon. member will take a look at *Hansard*, he will understand that it was some two weeks after the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) raised the question that he himself began to realize that the matter indeed was one which required attention.

I want to tell the hon. member that I listened to him very carefully last night, and while he led us through a tortuous, so-called historical description of events in Mexico, Iran and whatever oil-producing country he could conjure up, there was very little in the way of content or policy pronouncements in his speech. There was no effort on his part to tell us what the policy of his party is except to denounce the major policy instrument which is available to the Government of Canada in these circumstances, namely, Petro-Canada. I would like to return to that subject later on in my comments.

I would like to respond more seriously to the concerns which have been raised by members from Atlantic Canada with respect to energy security in that part of the country. In providing the reassurance to the people of those four provinces that the government is conscious of their needs, I would like to lay to rest some of the incorrect assertions which have been made by hon. members opposite and particularly to draw attention to some of the unjustified scare tactics which have been used; for example, the allegation that people will be freezing in the dark next winter because of the negligence of the Government of Canada.

I regard that allegation as no contribution in what is a serious situation. Nowhere in Canada were the implications of the 1973 energy crisis more clear than in Atlantic Canada. As the supply crisis developed into a price crisis, the Government of Canada took immediate action to protect the oil-importing provinces from massive increases in offshore oil prices. In his historical review the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham made no reference to that imaginative oil import compensation program which was set up to subsidize eastern consumers through tax revenues collected from western exports. Since January, 1974 a total of—I was going to say a total of approximately \$1.9 billion, but almost \$2 billion has been transferred in subsidies in favour of the consumers of Atlantic Canada. These compensation payments have allowed the necessary time for adaptation to higher costs. Equally important, they have helped to protect the Atlantic provinces from becoming unattractive from the point of view of industrial development.

Of course, the oil import compensation program provided relief from a crisis situation, and it still provides relief, but in