

Oil Substitution Act

Canadian Oil Substitution Program on March 31 of this year, instead of its original termination date of December 31, 1990. As I say, judging from the correspondence, phone calls and even telegrams we have had from our constituents, we are not alone in saying that the CHIP and COSP programs have been very valuable and cost effective. Compare them with PIP grants, one of the disasters of the previous Government. I have yet to see any of the money which has gone into the PIP grants actually produce any real effective results. In fact, according to research done last year, much of the money was thrown down the tube when contrasted with the money spent on CHIP and COSP.

• (1650)

Mr. McDermid: PetroCan takes the most.

Ms. Jewett: I know the Parliamentary Secretary yells a lot, but he does not get up and defend this iniquitous legislation.

Mr. McDermid: This is the first time I have seen you in the House.

Ms. Jewett: As he knows, we are proposing a six-month hoist. If this Bill goes ahead and passes at second reading, it will pass in principle. It is all very well for Members opposite to say it will be going into committee, but there is no way, from my knowledge and experience, that the committee is going to be able to amend this Bill in such a way as to extend its application or restore the original dates of termination. So while there is always much benefit to be derived from legislation going to a Standing Committee of the House for further refinement, I think the fundamental point to be made here is that this Government simply would not accept in committee any changes to this legislation. The little bit of tinkering it might accept would have nothing to do with restoring the original termination dates or even extending the current termination dates of both programs.

As many Hon. Members have said, if the Government is serious about attacking the deficit, why does it not look at some things like the PIP grants which do not benefit Canadian society? Indeed, in many documented cases, the money has been thrown away with nothing having been achieved. Many of my constituents have already taken advantage of the CHIP and COSP programs and they are aware of their value.

Let me remind the House again that of the \$885 million paid out in CHIP grants to the end of 1984, approximately \$200 million flowed back to the federal and provincial Governments in the form of taxes. As well, 2.5 million housing units, representing about one third of the eligible housing stock built before 1977, have taken advantage of the CHIP program. That is about one third. Perhaps the point most significant of all is that the total energy savings attributable to CHIP is estimated at the equivalent of perhaps 45,000 barrels of oil per day. It is true that Energy, Mines and Resources estimates that in the absence of CHIP some 35 per cent of these savings would not have been achieved, but this still means that CHIP is calculated to have resulted in incremental energy savings of roughly 30,000 barrels a day of oil equivalent, and that is a

major saving. Furthermore, the Department believes that if this program were continued, there would be further energy savings of 30 per cent.

Hon. Members will recall that the objective of COSP was to convert two million housing units off oil by 1990. If the Government could argue that we were not on target and the program had not been successful, we might understand the wish to terminate it. But in fact thus far almost one million housing units have been converted, and that is right on target. So why abandon the program?

It was observed in the other place that with the experience gained thus far in operating these two programs, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources projections indicated that there are substantially greater energy savings to be made than even the Department had originally anticipated. It was also noted that for older, poorly insulated and weather stripped homes, energy savings could be had at a cost of \$5 per barrel of oil equivalent. Under some circumstances, the cost could be as low as \$2 or \$3 per barrel of oil equivalent.

So I ask once again, why should the Government remove two highly efficient programs which are on target and which meet the needs of Canadians? They help energy conservation in this country, so why is the Government abandoning the programs? We would like to hear from the Government to know the answer to that question.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I note that there are only a couple of minutes left and I will not get into the meat of what I had to say. Perhaps I will save that for another day. I cannot help but think, though, that this Government has managed in a short few weeks to redefine simony and turn it into a political art form. Once it was the selling of ecclesiastical preferment; now it is the selling of political preferment, and I cannot help but feel that this Bill exemplifies that as well as anything we have seen over the course of the last few months.

I want to tell you that I had the opportunity recently to consult a person who is perhaps not an international authority but certainly an authority in this field, namely, Heather Grant, who raised with me some of the serious problems that could flow from the discontinuance of this program. I want to share with the House this afternoon or tomorrow or some day later in the week—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think the Hon. Member will have that opportunity. When the House meets again on Bill C-24, the Hon. Member will have nine minutes left in his speech.

[Translation]

Order, please. It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.