

Point of Order—Mr. Clark (Yellowhead)

came across my desk is very interesting. On a dollar for dollar basis it is now costing the average American consumer who goes to the gas pump in the United States equal or less money than he or she paid for gas in 1959. That takes into account inflation, the change in the dollar and everything else.

I have to question the common sense, the decency and even the intelligence of the Member opposite in making the kind of comments he makes, when it was he and his Party who supported the National Energy Program which resulted in all the disastrous changes which the energy consumers across this country have had to bear. The Hon. Member has to take responsibility for that; he was part of it. He does not even explain the PGRT and the PIP grants properly.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER—MR. CLARK (YELLOWHEAD)**SEIZURE OF TURKISH EMBASSY IN OTTAWA—TURKISH GOVERNMENT WARNING**

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate the indulgence of the House and will not be long.

Members will know that on Thursday, yesterday, in response to questions on the Turkish Embassy I told the House of Commons:

There was a request made in mid-February. There was a response made by the Government of Canada which was deemed satisfactory at the time by the Turkish Embassy. There has been no communication with the Turkish Embassy or the Turkish Government since that time.

That was my statement, Mr. Speaker. That statement was made after a thorough inquiry of Canadian officials who might have been contacted by Turkish authorities.

I have just learned that, contrary to the information given to me earlier, a representative of the Turkish Embassy here may have raised this matter with Canadian officials in late February or early March. I have ordered an immediate investigation and will report to the House.

I wanted, however, to take this earliest opportunity to correct the record and to apologize to the House for inadvertently conveying information which may have been inaccurate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there will be questions in Question Period tomorrow about this.

An Hon. Member: Tomorrow?

Mr. Waddell: I am sorry, Monday.

* * *

**OIL SUBSTITUTION AND CONSERVATION ACT
CANADIAN HOME INSULATION PROGRAM ACT****MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wise (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) that Bill C-24, an Act to amend the Oil Substitution and Conservation Act and the Canadian Home Insulation Program Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): I want to remind the Hon. Member that we voted against the Petroleum Incentive Program. The Hon. Member was in the House. The NDP did not support the National Energy Program. His Party voted for it. I ask him to check the record. Does he recall voting for the Petroleum Incentive Program? He voted against other aspects of the Energy Program as did my Party. We both voted for the conservation program.

Is the Hon. Member aware from his own department that this program is half complete? The object was to convert two million housing units off oil by 1990. So far one million units have been converted, at a saving of 75,000 barrels a day. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Miss Carney) said last week in Vancouver that the energy costs can be reduced by up to 30 per cent to cost effective conservation investments.

In view of the fact that the program seems to be working, it is only half way through and, according to the Minister herself, we could still reduce by 30 per cent the demand and use of oil, and in view of the restraint programs much as in my province of British Columbia where one day, one year, it is for restraint and on the next day the province suddenly finds its sense and isn't, why is the Government cutting back and saving a small amount of money on a perfectly sensible program that is saving oil? This is one of the few aspects of the energy program that is working? Why is the Hon. Member's Government eliminating that and not eliminating things like PIP grants of \$1.6 billion a year to oil companies, along with tax advantages? Why is the Government picking on the poor consumer and forgetting about other areas where money could be saved?

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I guess it is the Hon. Member's duty and disposition to be pessimistic. One of the things he really does not include in his thinking or in his comments is the fact that even prior to COSP there were significant conversions. There is no reason to expect that there will not be a significant number of conversions after. We intend to continue and even expand our efforts to encourage people and to inform them of the benefits that can come to them if they switch off oil when it is appropriate and reasonable for them to do so. Natural gas is probably one of the best examples. Electricity can be used in other areas, but there could be a reasonable