

Canadian homes have been completely renovated but, given the stubbornness of Government Members, the most we can do is request a six-month hoist in order to give Canadians a chance to make use of this good program.

● (1510)

Mr. A. H. Harry Brightwell (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on Bill C-24, an Act to amend the Oil Substitution and Conservation Act and the Canadian Home Insulation Program Act. I have been waiting for something like eleven days for this opportunity to speak. I had planned to speak on the debating habits of this House, how insults fly back and forth and why my constituents back home do not really appreciate it. They are people who are productive. They work hard. They are prosperous.

I would have liked the Hon. Member, whose riding I have forgotten, to be here today to talk about prosperity. He has a riding on the edge of Ottawa. He says his people are poor, that their annual income is \$1,000 less than the national average and 81 per cent of them own their own houses. I would like to tell this House that my riding is quite prosperous. The people earn \$2,000 less than the national average, but 71 per cent of their own their houses.

I talked to the Hon. Member across the floor and discovered the reason. Part of his riding is in this dream world called Ottawa. Salaries of the people in Ottawa are quite high but the salaries of those who live away from Ottawa are more realistic or in the poorer range. Thus the Hon. Member comes out with a high average. He claimed there are very poor and very rich in his riding.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his comments about Ottawa being a dream world. I represent 80,000 people who live in Ottawa. They do not consider it a dream world. It is a real world for them. Some work for the Government and some do not. I do not think any Hon. Member should make that kind of comment in relation to constituents of another Hon. Member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the question raised by both Members is more a question of debate than a point of order. The Hon. Member for Perth.

Mr. Brightwell: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the methods of debate and about the insults that are hurled across the floor. I want to speak a little more about this if I may. We have heard words such as "bum-boy", "yes-man", and there is a very derogatory phrase that I hear coming across the floor, namely "Mike the Knife". I dislike that terribly. Of course, we have called Members opposite malcontents and rats. We are going to be careful about doing that in the future—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must ask the Hon. Member to speak on the Bill.

Mr. Brightwell: Mr. Speaker, I will speak on the Bill although I find it unusual in this House for Members to speak

Oil Substitution Act

on the Bill. It seems that Members speak on many other things.

Mr. Heap: Speak for yourself.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Brightwell: I have to sort through my papers, Mr. Speaker, because that comes much later in my speech.

I would have liked to speak about how my constituents feel concerning the way in which we delay items in this House. We are presently in a delaying posture here. The question we are talking about is how the Opposition chooses to delay Bills going through this House and why this should happen when the end result we know is inevitable. My constituents say to me: "You have the manpower; go to Ottawa and make things happen in the House". I hope when my constituents read this speech in *Hansard* they will understand that the reason we are being delayed is through the use of these funny rules by the Opposition on the other side.

Mr. Waddell: Funny rules?

Mr. Brightwell: I withdraw that. Funny rules is not proper. The use of the rules to delay is what I mean.

I will come to the meat of this debate now, Mr. Speaker. I consider it a waste of time to reiterate the figures about the two programs. This has been done so aptly by other Members. I have a few comments to make. I must admit there are very few comments about the Bill and there are more about the other things, but you have told me that I cannot make those comments, Mr. Speaker.

At least two speakers have spoken about the direct subsidies to home owners and the insulation and home fuel industry. The last speaker talked about the attack on lower income people and how they would like to have jobs created by funds from the federal Government. I believe this is a prime example of the Opposition's fuzzy thinking about governments and deficits. The Opposition believes that if we run up a deficit it does not cost the average home owner a cent. When I wrote this speech, I was thinking about a \$30 billion deficit this fiscal year. I know now it is about \$35 billion. The carrying charges for that amount to about \$120 for every person in Canada for one year. The savings on oil are savings forever. We have heard Hon. Members say that you may save a dollar today and it keeps saving forever. But a deficit of \$35 billion keeps costing forever because it is authorized into the future.

No one can possibly say that deficit reduction is somehow divorced from the welfare of every Canadian. My Party, this Government, was elected by the people who know that this is a major problem for Canadians. People know that government spending is out of control. I hope I can say "was" out of control. People want changes and the changes that we propose today are just another step in that particular direction.

I agree with Members across the floor that the programs were successful, and the changes that have occurred since 1977 are a reason for them not being in place any more. There has