

The COSP and CHIP programs were indeed excellent programs brought in by the Liberal Government of the past.

An Hon. Member: That's right, the past.

Mr. Boudria: Should I describe it as the Liberal Government of the past and the Liberal Government of the future? That is what we will be after the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Boudria: Let us look at some of the benefits of these programs. Over one-third of the housing stock of the country built prior to 1977 had benefited from these programs. The programs were indeed very successful ones. CHIP grants were provided to many homes across the country and, contrary to the popular belief of some Conservative members, it is not only rich people who own their own homes. As a matter of fact, I represent a constituency in which almost everyone owns his own home. Over 85 per cent of the population of my riding is comprised of people who live in their own homes. The average income of the people of my riding is considerably less than the national average. To me, that would mean that owning one's own home in my constituency does not mean that one is rich; it means that there are no apartments so a home is the only place in which one can live. That means that if one's salary is lower than the national average, one needs assistance in order to heat one's home.

In order to heat their homes in the past, my constituents were required to use oil. The majority of homes in my riding are heated by oil. There are one or two communities which happen to have natural gas. As natural gas was being installed in other communities, many people wanted to convert their heating systems and again, through financial constraints, were unable to do so. Through the COSP Program of the Government, for example, some people were able to convert their oil furnaces to natural gas or electricity in order to free themselves from being prisoners of a system which was ever causing prices of oil to increase and become less and less affordable.

In the national interest the Government recognized that if it was to keep a large portion of the population from being held prisoner by the need to purchase imported oil, it could do so by converting consumption to other forms of energy and by reducing consumption through energy conservation. These two programs achieved both of those objectives and indeed were excellent programs.

● (1200)

A chart which was produced in the last edition of *The Financial Post* indicates that in 1984 there was a net reduction of 8 per cent in fuel oil consumption in Canada. I think that is significant. We have an increase of 8 per cent in natural gas consumption. Inevitably, the programs which have assisted the people of Canada in converting their heating systems and conserving energy have been successful. I do not know why the Government wants to disband two programs which have been very successful. Perhaps it is for purely partisan reasons that the Conservatives want to abolish these successful Liberal

Oil Substitution Act

programs. But Liberal programs were not only designed for Liberals, they were designed for the benefit of all Canadians. If the Liberal programs have been successful, maybe Conservative members should start to become more objective and less partisan.

The Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) told us that conversion and conservation only happened in concert with prices. In other words, if a product is priced out of existence, of course, people will convert to another product. Perhaps that is the policy of the Conservative Party, to increase energy prices so much that people will not be able to afford it and therefore, those people will have to convert to another product. But that was not the policy of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party tried to keep those products affordable for Canadians. The Liberals did not want to bankrupt the Maritimes, Quebec, or threaten eastern Canada. Indeed, the program was very successful.

I see a Conservative member in the House who said the other day that the only people who were benefiting from the program were the rich people who were buying heat pumps with a government subsidy. Well, perhaps his constituents belong to that financial bracket, but mine do not. The people of my constituency have larger than average households compared with the rest of the country. The census document for my riding indicates that 89.6 per cent of all housing stock is single family dwellings. The people of my constituency, whether they are well off or poor, have their own homes. The poor people may have larger mortgages, but nevertheless they do not have a choice when it comes to paying their heating bills. That bill is there whether they like it or not.

My constituency also has very high unemployment. The people of my riding do not have money to pay exorbitant oil prices. According to the census, the average income of the people in my riding is close to \$1,000 less per person than the national average. With this evidence, it is quite obvious that the people of Glengarry-Prescott-Russell do not want the program to terminate. It was a good program from which the people benefited.

The Hon. Member for Calgary West said that the legislation was insane. He and his colleagues in the Conservative Party unanimously supported a Bill which they now claim is insane. Perhaps he should verify his voting record in the House before making such a claim.

As part of the famous "Mike the Knife" Tory cut-back book, Canadians will realize a fuel price increase of 1.8 cents per litre. The people will have no assistance to free themselves from the price of heating oil. There will be no programs of assistance—again according to the wishes of the Government—for Canadians to conserve energy and add insulation to their homes. The Government says that is all right. It says that if Canadians do not have bread to eat, then they can eat cake. The Government says that conservation will still take place. Well, if conservation will take place, why did that not happen before this program was enacted? Obviously, incentive was required in order to achieve that conservation. The incentive which is required should be manifested in the leadership of the