

of one kind or another in new energy sources. Far from being a vague statement, it was a categorical and clear-cut statement.

In terms of the specific projects that will be funded in one way or another by these revenues, an announcement will be made in due course. But there is no question about our intent to recycle these funds from the energy tax into the economy to increase our capacity and to enhance our supply of domestically produced energy.

**Senator Perrault:** May I ask, then: Can the minister explain the source of concern on the part of Premier Davis, a Conservative premier, I understand, who campaigned for the honourable minister, and the man who campaigned for the Conservative Party in the last federal election? Why is the Premier of Ontario unconvinced that the specifics simply are not there for energy conservation?

**Senator de Cotret:** Well, honourable senators, I would certainly be happy to ask him the next time I see him. I have no idea why he has concerns of this nature. Our plans have been clearly laid out. This is not a proposal that we put forth last night in terms of energy. This is a policy. This is the policy of the federal government with respect to energy. It is the policy that will lead us to self-sufficiency by 1990. It is the policy that this country needs to insure itself against the uncertainty of foreign supplies. It is the only responsible policy that this government can take at this time, to give Canadians the access to their own energy supplies that they deserve and require.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Senator Perrault:** Well, for some curious reason the same applause for the government is not being accorded by provincial Conservatives in Queen's Park this afternoon.

The honourable minister stated that these promises in the budget are not vague, and yet in his own words he said a moment ago, "We are going to spend these monies in one way or another on energy projects." Perhaps the minister may wish to cite one specific segment of the program. Surely in the planning stage the minister has specific projects which can be delineated more exactly rather than assuring us this afternoon that the money is going to be spent "in one way or another."

● (1420)

**Senator de Cotret:** Well, certainly, honourable senators, I could talk about a number of projects or programs that were referred to in the budget speech last night.

**Senator Buckwold:** We have time. Keep talking.

**Senator de Cotret:** Oh, yes, I will. I have time, too. There is no rush. It is a sufficiently important document for Canada that it deserves time.

We have talked, for example, about the need to provide funds to help industry and also to help heavy oil energy users and to help homeowners in various parts of the country to convert from oil to natural gas, because as you well know we have abundant supplies of natural gas but we have a shortage of oil. One of the stated objectives of our strategy is to encourage that kind of switchover from oil to natural gas. Part of those funds will be allocated for that purpose.

Part of the funds will also be allocated for the purpose of encouraging the shift from the oil-powered generation of electricity in the Atlantic provinces to the generation of electricity through other sources. Part will be devoted to fund specific offshore energy programs.

I think all of those examples, or examples along those lines, were provided by the minister last night either in his budget speech or in the documents that accompanied the budget speech.

In terms of exact dollars, we have made a commitment. We have made a commitment that the funds that would be derived from the energy tax would be recycled in the economy for purposes such as this. We have given examples; we have made the commitment.

If there is a certain degree of prescience on the part of members opposite that we have not yet been fortunate enough to attain to in terms of exactly how much it will cost to encourage the conversion, for example, from the use of oil in various segments of our economy to a greater reliance on natural gas, I would be most happy to receive that information. But we will be introducing a program shortly to move along in just those ways.

We have also talked about the CHIP program. That was mentioned specifically in the budget speech. That program has been highly successful in terms of the participation of Canadians in increasing the insulation in their homes. We have talked about expanding that program and we have also talked about the possibility, since it is a housing program, of transferring that program to the provinces, with the adequate funding to carry it out.

Those are all examples, and I presume the honourable senator was asking for examples. There is a long list of things that have to be done. They have to be done now, if we are to ensure that as a nation we are no longer dependent on decisions made outside our borders in terms of our energy future.

#### EXCISE TAX ON GASOLINE—FEDERAL SUBSIDY FOR URBAN TRANSIT

**Senator Perrault:** May I ask the Honourable the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce a question relating to the price of gasoline? This morning there was a traumatic shock awaiting motorists when they drove up to the gas pumps and found that they now have to pay almost \$1.40 per gallon for gasoline. Many of them would like to have the option of lower-cost urban transport. They would like to have the opportunity to leave their automobiles in the garage and use urban transport to get to work.

On April 4 of 1977 the Honourable Sinclair Stevens, now President of the Treasury Board, stated that, "the very first Conservative budget will see \$290 million to encourage the urban transit system." I want to ask the minister what happened to the promise made by Mr. Stevens that \$290 million for urban transit would be made available in this budget.

**Senator de Cotret:** Urban transit is very much under consideration. I can assure the honourable senator that it is well