

debate as to whether that is a long-term totally desirable objective.

The Hon. Member continues to try somehow to cast two sides of this scene in terms of consumers; people on the street who need to buy gas, oil, heating oil, and other energy requirements, in contrast to the needs for development in Canada of our resources and the needs of Canadian industry, Canadian oil and gas producers—small ones, not the big ones which the Hon. Member talks about. There is no question that that industry is taxed heavily. The PGRT is the basis of providing PIP grants. Maybe PIP grants are not right either. There are really not two sides. When the system is running smoothly and when there are benefits to producers, industry and secondary industry across Canada will benefit. When everything is working, who really benefits is the Canadian taxpayer and those people who have to buy oil and gas products are the real beneficiaries.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member.

[*Translation*]

Order please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon. I shall then give the floor to the Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard-Anjou (Mr. Gagliano).

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. When the House rose at one o'clock, the Chair promised that the Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard-Anjou (Mr. Gagliano) would be given the floor after the luncheon recess.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard-Anjou): Mr. Speaker, once again I must draw the attention of the House to a manoeuvre on the part of the Progressive Conservative Party that will cause serious harm to the Canadian economy and to many Canadians. I think there is grave cause for alarm when we see the present Government once again camouflaging the extremely negative impact of Bill C-24 by failing to give Canadians a true picture of what the consequences of this Bill will be.

After the Domtar case, the Progressive Conservative Government is once again aiming its guns at Quebec with a Bill that will deprive Quebecers of hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies.

Where are the Conservative spokesmen for Quebec? have they been gagged once again? Are they afraid to defend the interests of their constituents?

Oil Substitution Act

The Conservative Members of Quebec ought to know that in 1983-84, 59 per cent of the grants they want to eliminate today were being paid to people in Quebec. Is this how they intend to defend the interests of their constituents?

However, in addition to the specific problems that repealing the Oil Substitution and Conservation Act will cause in Quebec, it is also obvious that it will have a disastrous impact on Canada as a whole.

Out of sheer ignorance, because I can hardly believe that conscientious members of this House would knowingly support a Bill like Bill C-24, Conservative Members are questioning the very foundation of Canada's energy policy. Everything done in recent years to make energy self-sufficient has suddenly been put on hold by a Government that would rather sell the country to the highest bidder instead of securing its future and its future autonomy.

Action programs for the benefit of energy consumers, which the present Government wants to abolish, were introduced in 1980 by a Liberal Government that understood Canada's energy requirements. These programs had three main goals: first, Canada was to maximize energy conservation; second, it was essential to reduce oil consumption and to maximize the use of alternative energy sources such as natural gas, wood and electric power or solar energy; and third, it was essential to make alternative energy sources available to Canadians by developing the infrastructure for their distribution.

A number of very well documented studies prepared by officials in various departments, as well as consultations held among the parties concerned, were instrumental, in 1980, in setting annual goals for conversion of residential and industrial heating systems that would help to reach the objectives I mentioned earlier.

Experts have indicated without hesitation that a minimum of ten years would be necessary to attain the objectives in question. Now, the Progressive Conservative Government, through Bill C-24, intends to tamper with the very foundation of this energy planning program.

Jean-François Villon, speaking on behalf of Gaz Métropolitain Inc. on November 7, 1984 in *The Gazette*, said:

—the reasons which led the federal government to promote the substitution of natural gas to oil are just as valid today as they were three years ago. The supply of Canada oil is quickly decreasing and new oil developments will be extremely costly.

In that interview, Jean-François Villon stated that arguments for continued subsidies are so compelling that it is essential to keep this program.

The need for Canada to reduce its dependency on oil, the need for a new impetus in the Alberta economy and the need to ensure the profitability of the \$400 million spent during three years to improve the availability of natural gas in Quebec makes it imperative, Jean-François Villon says, to keep the residential and industrial substitution program.