

Sale of Polymer

ment Corporation, the NDP and our party have marched side by side. There were occasions when we might have had different motives and intents, but when one examines the debate on the legislation—save for some of the rather silly socialist amendments which were moved at the time of the report stage—one finds we were identical in the positions which we took.

Today, we can understand that the hon. member for York South has served clear notice on the House and on the country that he and his party are determined to support the government throughout in their alleged legislative proposals. We now see it quite clearly demonstrated that there is, in fact, a coalition government in this country, and the hon. member for York South has made it quite plain that that is the situation today, that that is what this country and this House has to expect in the days which lie ahead.

An hon. Member: They are stretcher bearers.

Mr. Baldwin: Let us just look very briefly at this matter of consistency. At the time the Canada Development Corporation bill was first before the House I moved on a point of order that the bill be dealt with as a hybrid bill because elements of the public and private sectors were brought together. I was supported on that by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). So amendments were moved at the second reading stage. The NDP moved an amendment and so did we. The amendment which I moved involved a suggestion that the subject matter of the bill be sent to the committee for study. That was rejected by the government. In the debate on second reading, statements were made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) making it quite plain that one of the principal reasons we opposed the legislation was that it did, in fact, provide for the capacity of the Canada Development Corporation to take over Polymer. That was not only our position but the position of the NDP. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland), in what I thought was a very good speech on February 23, 1971, at page 3679 of *Hansard* said precisely this in speaking about the proposal. In the last sentence of the paragraph he summed it up as follows:

Where is the equity in that kind of situation?

He was speaking about the sale of Polymer by the government to the Canada Development Corporation.

The Social Credit party, which is now quite uncertain of its position—something it has shown throughout this session—also took this position. The hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), speaking for his party, made it quite plain that he objected to the legislative proposals and that he concurred in what was said by the hon. member for Edmonton West who, speaking for us, indicated one of the reasons for our objection was the right which existed for the Canada Development Corporation to take over Polymer. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who participated in the debate on March 2, 1971, said precisely the same thing in his contribution to the debate, and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) made the same proposition in a very strong speech. As recorded at page 3880 of *Hansard* of March 2, 1971, he said:

[Mr. Baldwin.]

The second reason why I call this bill a monstrosity is that it proposes to sell out four Crown corporations. It proposes to sell the Polymer Corporation, which produces synthetic rubber and which has been a very successful operation;

This is precisely the position which we have taken consistently, and I am amazed that my friends to my left have now seen fit to depart from this particular position.

In committee, after the Canada Development Corporation bill passed second reading, the same stance was taken. When it came back from the committee, there were some amendments at the report stage. One of the amendments which we supported was the amendment referred to by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) which proposed to delete clause 39 giving the right to the Canada Development Corporation to take over Polymer. All opposition parties voted against the bill on third reading. When this matter came up in the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates a short time ago, the hon. member for Yukon and other hon. members of our party who detected what had been suppressed so far by the government, pursued the issue and said exactly the same things then as they have said since.

This motion, then, is the natural product and the natural corollary of the position which this party took right from the very inception of the Canada Development Corporation proposal, throughout the debates on second and third reading and right until today. It was the natural, logical and inevitable step which we felt compelled to take because of the positions which we had taken in the past. So far as we are concerned, we would have been derelict in our duty if, knowing what the facts were, we had not taken this position. I quite accept the fact that it is not possible for this parliament, or at least for the House, by a motion of this kind to set aside the sale. That will take a new parliament and a new government. I suggest to my friends to my left who say—and I quite agree with the hon. member for York South on this—that this motion would not, in fact, result in the cancellation of the sale that it did result in there being a new government, it would start the process of dealing with this matter fairly adequately.

Mr. Sharp: Would you then cancel the sale?

Mr. Stanfield: You bet your life, on those terms. Don't worry about it.

Mr. Baldwin: Precisely. This has been our position throughout from the very beginning for good and adequate reasons, and I think the hon. member for Yukon and other hon. members who speak will make a very good case to show why this should be done. Certainly, spokesmen on the government side have made no case at all. The burden rests on them. They have failed miserably to discharge that burden. Unless they have some more adequate spokesmen for their side, I suggest that they stand guilty of making a very bad deal for the people of Canada.

• (1640)

On the question raised by the hon. member for York South about the legislation waiting approval, I gather from what he said that he is prepared for this parliament to continue interminably in the faint hope that the government, which has shown itself so lax, so impotent in its