

*Oil Substitution Act*

is not relevant to the legislation as such, and I am doing this quite objectively, as much for this side of the House as for the other. The Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps).

**Ms. Copps:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would simply point out to the House that I was referring to the Canadian Oil Substitution Program, when the Minister rose on a fallacious point of order to interrupt me. Therefore, if you are here to interrupt me on different matters, that is your right, but you are simply chopping up my speech.

[English]

I can understand why government Members are a little jittery. At the same time, the Government is moving to cut the COSP and CHIP programs, we look to the Prime Minister's Office to see what kind of an example he is giving to the Canadian people. He is saying, "You cannot benefit from COSP because we are going to terminate it. But I can turn around and increase my own office budget by 57 per cent". He then has the nerve to say that it is a small percentage of the over-all Budget.

**Mr. McDermid:** Don Johnston said that.

**Ms. Copps:** I am sorry that the Hon. Member was not in the House when his Leader said it was a small percentage of the Budget. I realize he says so many things in so many places that it is very hard for him to remember what he said to whom, but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian people feel that the activities of the Prime Minister and his Government are stretching credibility to the utmost. They tell the Canadian people to tighten their belts. They say, "We are chopping, we are cutting back on COSP and the child tax credit". They tell 55-year old Canadian workers, "We are cutting out your opportunity for unemployment insurance".

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for always intervening, but the Hon. Member just used the words "child tax credit". I do not know if she knows what that credit is, but she will know from the consultation paper that there is an increase, and I wish she would stay with the facts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** I regret that a couple of minutes ago I listened perhaps at too great a length to certain points of order. This is obviously a question of debate, and there will be a question and comment period after the speech made by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps). The Hon. Minister may participate in the debate at that time.

**Mr. Taylor:** How about talking about the Bill?

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about the Bill for the last 20 minutes. What I have been saying is that this is another indication of the bad will of this Government. This Government was elected with a massive majority on the basis of promises that it was going to ensure the kind of Liberal programs which, by the admission of government Members here today, have worked. The Canadian Oil Substitution Program has worked. I urge government Members to rethink

their decision to terminate this program. In doing so they are stretching the credibility of this Government at the very time when their Prime Minister is raising his own budget by 57 per cent.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Questions or comments?

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will know that our Treasury bills today sold for 11.7 per cent for a three-month period. Does she also know that the savings to the Government on termination of COSP is \$424 million between now and 1988? On the CHIP program, it is \$376 million between now and 1988. Is it her view that we should increase the budget deficit and the burden on the children of Canada and their children as well as the home owners of Canada by darn near \$1 billion in order to supply insulation and new furnaces for the relatively well off in this country? Is that the Liberal policy?

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I am really confused. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn)—

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Copps:**—exhibits an incredible ignorance of the intent of the COSP program if he is suggesting that the upfront cost of off-oil conversion is going to contribute to the deficit in the long term. On the contrary, the words of his colleague from Nepean-Carleton, and others who have spoken on this issue in the House, clearly demonstrate that this particular measure is going to save the Canadian taxpayer money in the long run. I am sorry if the Hon. Member can only see as far as the end of his fiscal nose for 1985. In the Liberal Party we are concerned with the long-term future of this country and our determination to live within our own means with our own resources with the kind of help that was given to us through the COSP program. If he cannot understand that, then he does not understand what conservation really is.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government spent \$1.4 billion of taxpayers' money on these programs to the end of 1984. The return from income tax was about \$300 million. The net increase in the deficit and the burden on the taxpayer was over \$1 billion. Would she have us continue to borrow and borrow and borrow to assist the relatively affluent to reinsulate their homes and substitute new furnaces for old?

**Ms. Copps:** First of all, there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the people who took advantage of this program were the affluent. In fact, the Energy, Mines and Resources documents show just the opposite. The Hon. Member's Government has just tabled the highest Estimates in the history of this country. His Prime Minister can find funds to increase his own office budget by 57 per cent. How can the Hon. Member sit there with a straight face and talk about the track record of previous Liberal Governments when his own Prime Minister is a disgrace to the Canadian people?