

Motions

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) is a master of hyperbole. He talks about hypocrisy. As he sits in his social subsidized housing in Vancouver, as reported on television last night, he ought to use the facilities of the taxpayers of Canada who have given to him—

Mr. McDermid: At \$54,000 a year he is in subsidized housing?

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know what that has to do with the reply—

Mr. Mayer: What has the question got to do with the motion?

Mr. Gauthier: The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is in social housing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell).

Mr. Waddell: We are waiting for the answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) was trying to complete an answer on regulations and statutory instruments. We are getting into some high level debate which has nothing to do with today's debate. I will allow the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta to terminate whatever he was going to say so that we can get to further questions and comments.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I was simply responding to part of the statement made by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) accusing the Government of hypocrisy.

Mr. Robinson: Accusing the Member.

Mr. Friesen: Since the Member is so interested in social housing and meeting the needs of those people who have such dire needs while he himself is living in subsidized housing, according to the news report last night, unless that was wrong, I thought maybe we should draw that analogy.

More specifically, in answer to the Member's question which was more in the nature of a tirade rather than a question, I would suggest, as I did earlier in my remarks, that it was our Party which highlighted that issue when we were in opposition.

Mr. Robinson: What are you doing in Government?

Mr. Friesen: We have no less commitment to doing away with that provision. We are not satisfied with simply withdrawing that emergency planning order without dealing with the whole nature of the War Measures Act at the same time, which was the root of that problem. The Hon. Member might want to scotch-tape policies together and cut and paste, but we are not satisfied with that. Unless we want to have a recurrence of 1970 all over again, we have to deal not only with the emergency planning order but also with the War Measures

Act. The Hon. Member can rest assured that the Government will do that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North-Delta (Mr. Friesen), in connection with the language the Hon. Member used in referring to his colleagues in the House, when he said that the Committee had passed judgment or reported on a frivolous question.

Mr. Speaker, I can see nothing frivolous in asking the Government to follow recognized procedure, that is, to govern openly, by Order in Council, and to make regulations after adopting the Order in Council.

The question before the House today is as follows: Was the Government acting responsibly and fairly when it gazetted, on January 17, an Order in Council setting regulations to implement the Government's policy to eliminate the Canadian Home Insulation Program?

[*English*]

I fail to understand the Member's point, Mr. Speaker. He, like us in this House, was advised on January 18. I happen to have some dossiers here. Let me read part of a letter dated January 17.

Dear Member of Parliament:

This package is designed to provide you and your staff with details on the recent changes to the Canada Oil Substitution Program (COSP) and the Canadian Home Insulation Program (CHIP).

That officially gave us information on January 18 about what the Government's intentions were with regard to the implementation of the program.

Mr. McDermid: Nonsense.

Mr. Gauthier: It is not nonsense. The letter is dated and it is signed by Dennis Orchard, Director, Home Energy Programs.

● (1250)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. This is a question and comment period and the questions and comments are to be directed to the Hon. Member who just finished speaking. The Hon. Member has been here a long time and realizes that.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I was just informing the Member that I have a document dated January 17, 1985, indicating that the program would be terminated on December 31, 1984. How can the Member say that it is frivolous for a committee of the House, which has to review regulations, to come before the House and report that there has been an irregularity? In the language of the committee: "The joint committee criticizes the Minister of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for the manner in which grants to home owners were reduced during the phasing out of the Canadian Home Insulation Program". That has nothing to do with a November 9 statement in which the Government said it