

*Oil Substitution Act*

Government. But this Government has washed its hands of that responsibility. It tells us that the free market and the cartels will take care of the situation.

For Conservative members who believe it is wrong for the Government to be involved in regulating oil prices, when faced with the alternative of letting the cartels and industry regulate those prices, one has to ask, "Who speaks for Canadians?" Is it the multinationals or is it the Government of Canada? Surely, the Government should recognize that it is its job to govern. The Government should not wash its hands of that responsibility and give it to multinational companies. The Government says that it does not want to be involved and that the multinationals should regulate oil prices. That is the Conservative policy. It is wrong. That is not why the Government was elected six months ago today.

The Government was elected to fulfil a long series of promises. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will remember those promises because, like us, you suffered by listening to the litany of 338 promises which the Tories made. However, I do not remember a promise which indicated that the Government would abolish assistance for the poor, or assistance for people who could not afford to change their furnaces. In my riding the Conservative opponent did not say that. I am sure that gentleman did not stand on the stage in Alexandria, Hawkesbury or Rockland, and say to the good people of those communities: "Vote for me and I will cut off your grant". I did not hear my Conservative opponent saying that. That is not one of the promises which was made. The Conservative promises were to give everything to everyone all the time.

**Mrs. Sparrow:** We promised to cut the deficit.

**Mr. Boudria:** I am glad to hear a Conservative member saying that the Conservatives promised to cut the deficit. It is interesting to hear that, especially in view of the fact that 113 promises would have increased the deficit, and five of the promises would have reduced the deficit. In terms of revenue generation, two promises would have increased the funds coming in and 26 promises would have reduced those funds. I am glad the Conservative member has indicated that that was the policy of the Conservative Party during the election campaign. Obviously, those were not the policies of the Conservative Party.

The Government has asked the House to support legislation which will reduce benefits for the people of my riding who can least afford it. I say that we should not abolish these programs. We need this kind of legislation. All Hon. Members recognize that it was a good Bill and it was supported unanimously in 1981. It was supported by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) who is now shaking his head. He knew at the time that it was a good Bill and I would venture to say that he still thinks today that it is a good Bill, but someone is directing him with cue cards, and all of those other props the Conservatives use, to tell him to vote against this Bill.

● (1210)

**Mr. Lewis:** Cue cards?

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Boudria:** If he was a free-thinking Member as he sits in this House right now, he would not put up with that. I challenge him to stand and speak on behalf of his constituents.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** I will.

**Mr. Boudria:** I challenge him to speak for the people with low incomes who own their own homes and who need to free themselves from high oil prices, those who need to convert their heating systems. I challenge the Hon. Member to stand and speak for those people, Mr. Speaker; not just for multinationals and the very large companies, but for average Canadians, because they are the ones who elected Hon. Members to this House. They are the ones who want fair and honest representation from all of us. They don't want that grant cut off. They don't want to see these very good Liberal initiatives abolished. I am sure that deep down inside all Hon. Members across from me and the book-ends on this side, Mr. Speaker, really want to see this kind of measure retained.

The Tories have always been able to use double-speak very effectively. They tell us that they can be all things to all people. But the true side of the Tories is shown up when they introduce these kinds of "let them eat cake" measures. I am sure that the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald), who is very concerned about the well-being of the people of this country—

**Miss MacDonald:** That's right.

**Mr. Boudria:**—would stand in her place, if she could—but she can't—and speak on behalf of the people of Kingston and the Islands. She would speak on behalf of those voters because she knows that abolishing this kind of measure is a very sick joke indeed on the part of the Conservative Party. More particularly, it is a vicious attack by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). "Mike the Knife" is sticking it into the backs of all the poor people of this country when he introduces this kind of measure. I urge all Hon. Members to vote against it.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** The Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) has indicated that this program is meant to assist the poor. I was wondering if he could describe in what way this program deliberately helps the poor over the relatively rich? It seems to me only those people who own homes are entitled to these programs. Any cultural study which is carried out across the country would indicate that the people who own homes are usually better off in the community than those people who do not own homes; for example, those people who rent. Could the Hon. Member enlighten us as to how this is a program to help the poor, the under privileged and the downtrodden? Or is it perhaps just a regular Liberal program which is designed to ensure the national debt gets larger, that our children have greater burdens on their shoulders and that the people are bought with their own money?

If it was such a good program, I wonder why, in terms of purchase of votes, the Liberal Party did not do as well this