

Oil Substitution Act

Description	Costs	
	Person-Years	\$
5. Archeological research for new development in existing parks	7	210,000
6. Effects of toxic substances from industry, agriculture and forestry on wildlife	9	412,000
7. Wildlife research in national parks	12.5	483,000
8. Effects of forestry practices on wildlife	5.5	258,000
9. Research on transboundary wildlife populations	0.5	20,000
10. Research on endangered prairie fauna	1.0	45,000
11. Environmental assessment of the impact of energy projects/industrial development on wildlife and shore-birds and their habitat	2.0	80,000
12. Pathology and bioelectronics services	5.0	190,000

DOLLAR COINS

Question No. 272—Mrs. Killens:

Does the Government intend to have issued, dollar coins and, if so, will provisions be made to include, on the coins, distinctive signs for the visually handicapped?

Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Canada now issues about 2,300,000 dollar coins annually. The Miscellaneous Estimates Committee is reviewing the matter of a \$1 coin in more detail. The Royal Canadian Mint is recommending a revised coin design that takes into consideration the needs of the visually handicapped.

[English]

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

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 now read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works; and the amendment of Mr. Cassidy (p. 3072).

Hon. Douglas C. Frith (Sudbury): I know I have 60 seconds left, Mr. Speaker. I just want to implore the Government side to listen to the representations of Members of Parliament who represent constituents in northern Canada and allow an extension of the deadline for the phasing out of COSP, which would

be of great benefit to the constituents in northern Canada who find, because of weather and a shortage of material, that contractors are unable to complete their work. This extension would go a long way to appeasing the viewpoints of our constituents.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak again to Bill C-24 on oil substitution and conservation and on home insulation. One of the real values of keeping this Bill before the House as long as it has been is that it gives the opportunity to people to let us know exactly how they feel about this Bill. Since I last spoke on the Bill a couple of weeks ago I have had about 20 letters, almost all taking the same position. People need this oil substitution Bill extended rather than cut. The idea of keeping a Bill before the House and maybe hoisting it for six months allows the public to take a good look at the Bill, to judge it and then let us know how they feel about it.

I strongly support a motion to hoist this Bill because that will give not only the people of Canada an opportunity to take a look at this Bill, but it will also give an opportunity to the present Government to back off and make use of the Bill in a different way.

As a matter of interest, I want to list a number of reasons that have been conveyed to me in letters from my constituents. The reason that comes most often from my constituency is that gas supply is just now reaching a person's farm or house. If this Bill cuts off the opportunity for substitution, that person will not be able to take advantage of the structure presently in place. Is that fair, Mr. Speaker? Just because gas does not reach an individual's home until this summer or the summer after, is he not going to be able to take advantage of the substitution grants?

A second reason and one which has been mentioned many times already is that the ground is frozen. People will not be able to dig until after April. Therefore a person is forced into a position where he will get less of the substitution grant than someone who was able to take advantage of it last fall.

The third reason one hears is from the person who has been planning to substitute his energy supply for years. Now he is only going to be able to do about half as much work as before. Another reason is that a person would have been able to afford conversion but cannot now because the grant will not be as big as expected. All of this is information that has been passed to us from our constituents.

● (1510)

I have not received—and I think the same goes for my colleagues—as many letters from people worried about the loss of CHIP grants, probably because that program has been used much more extensively and has not been dependent upon the availability of gas or other forms of fuel. However, the general tenor of the letters has been much the same, that it is unfair to take away these grants since some people have not had an opportunity to make use of them while other people, even in the same areas, have had an opportunity to do so. The other