program? Why are they dropping a program that in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

In British Columbia in 1985, if this program had not been terminated, 11,375 home owners would have been able to take advantage of it. Yet we see those same Hon. Members who said it worked denying to a potential 144,000 home owners across this country in one single fiscal year the chance to develop an energy efficient alternative through the Canadian Oil Substitution Program.

I am sorry if it hurts Government Members when I say that they are not fighting for home owners. I am sorry it hurts the feelings of those Hon. Members on the government side of the House who express frustration when I point out in this House that that single act of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation of doubling the cost of mortgage insurance will cost the average new home owner in Canada over $3,000 over the life of his or her mortgage. I am sorry if that hurts the feelings of hon. members of the Government. I am also sorry that this Government in its first few months in office, with an overwhelmingly solid mandate from the Canadian people, has not seen fit to fight for and promote the very issues which it talked about in the election campaign.

I look to the famous government promises book. The Government made 39 promises about energy. It dealt, for example, with setting up a special program to encourage the use of alcohol as a lead substitute for octane boosting. Consider the possibility of providing funds to help with the construction of a tidal power plant or providing funds for provincial utilities to investigate the feasibility of the construction of wind farms. How many of these alternatives, these renewable resources, have in fact seen the light of day since the Government, with its massive majority, took office? What we have seen is no move toward more conservation.

I think the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Tupper) was right when he made the freudian slip by saying he enjoyed this move towards "conservatism". I believe what we have seen in this House is not a move toward conservation or the encouragement of conservation but a move toward the true Conservative philosophies which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) tried to hide from the Canadian people during the time of the election. The Prime Minister pretended to the Canadian people that he was going to respect universality. The Prime Minister pretended that he was going to encourage programs like the Canadian Oil Substitution Program. The Prime Minister pretended to Canadians that he was not going to hit out at the elderly by cutting back on their old age pensions, or the older workers. The Prime Minister and the Government throughout the election campaign told the Canadian people that they could rest assured—the Conservatives were like wolves in sheep's clothing—that programs which have been developed and built by Liberals are going to be safeguarded. The Conservatives said those programs were going to be kept because they believe in medicare, universality and off-oil energy substitution. In fact, the moment they were elected, they showed their true colours. Their true colours were to cut the Canadian energy conservation program. The only place—

Mr. Epp (Provencher): I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member obviously can enter into debate in whatever way she wishes. However, she cannot use this House to make statements which are not fact. When she said there have been cuts in social policies and that we are going to continue, that simply is not the fact.

• (1610)

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this Government has introduced a document which considers doing just that.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, this is what happened today in Question Period. You cannot change the wording and leave the same impression. The Member is doing the very same thing again. I say to her that we have not cut, there has been no intention to cut, and in fact there has been an increase in the spouses' allowance. They were the ones who objected to it.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but the facts belie the statement made by the Minister. The facts will show that the Govenent is currently considering abolition of the tax deductions available to people with families. If you do not consider that to be an anti-child and anti-family move, then I do not think you have the pulse of the Canadian people. If you think the Canadian people will stand by and allow this Government to do away with tax exemptions for people who have families, I think you are wrong. I think the Minister will recognize that a single person earning $40,000 a year should pay more in taxes than a family person supporting four or five children. I think that is a basic Canadian right and I think the Minister and his Government must in fact be tricking the Canadian people. On the one hand they issue a document which suggests a reduction or abolition of the child tax credit and at the same time they stand there with straight faces and tell people there is no change.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. May I suggest to the Hon. Member that the issues being discussed for the past few minutes may not specifically concern the Bill we are debating this afternoon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rossi: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) on a point of order.

Mr. Rossi: Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) is responding to the comments made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I would suggest to the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) that I have no intention of inflaming the debate. The reason I stepped in is precisely to avoid discussions from both sides on a matter that