

Energy Supplies

would then be tabled. The Conservative amendment would allow for a motion to disallow the allocation program to be made within 25 days and disposed of within 15 days.

However, the real catch—and this is why we say that it subverts in a roundabout way—is that if the motion is not disposed of one way or another within the 15-day period, the mandatory allocation program announced by the government would automatically die. It seems to me that no government, in wanting to act responsibly, could allow this kind of cut-off to take place, this automatic undermining of a policy.

Surely if we have the debate when the government announces that an emergency is in existence, and if the House of Commons approves that there is an emergency, then we should accept the fact and not do as these three amendments suggest, that is, subvert the decision made by the majority in the House of Commons. Surely that is a normal and accepted practice. If we have a full debate and air the issues, we then accept the consequences of the vote of the day and the subsequent decision.

It seems to me that to go along with the idea of these amendments, which say that if we cannot resolve the matter either in the affirmative or the negative after 15 days any action the government may take to allocate supplies must immediately terminate, we are right back at square one and in the position of going through the whole process again. This will only cause chaos and confusion in terms of energy supplies throughout the country. It would prevent the government from acting quickly and effectively to ensure that Canadians receive their energy supplies by means of rationing or whatever form of allocation would take place.

As I say, in a way these amendments are a ploy and almost a subterfuge to undermine responsible action by government. We may disagree, as the opposition does on many occasions, with the policies of the government, but in the end we must allow that government, duly elected, to make decisions and take action. Otherwise parliament will degenerate into an ineffective operation and Canadian consumers will suffer the consequences.

I would have preferred the Conservative party to develop a more rational approach to energy in Canada and the problem of supply.

● (1500)

I cannot for the life of me see why they are wedded to this absurd proposal to dismantle Petro-Canada, the only option that gives us a chance to combat the arbitrary decision-making of the multinational oil companies in Canada as witnessed so recently by the Imperial-Exxon affair. If we do not have a publicly owned corporation to take effective measures, we will be forever at the mercy of these foreign oil companies which already own 90 per cent of our oil production.

We have to take steps to establish an alternative. Surely, in light of our past energy situation, that has to be a Crown corporation such as Petro-Canada. I wish the government were more serious about how it uses Petro-Canada. The minister likes to wrap himself in the flag and tell us how he is going to

use Petro-Canada to get at the big bad boys, Exxon and Imperial. He can go a lot further in terms of having Petro-Canada take over the 100,000 barrels a day allocation that Imperial gives to eastern Canada so that we do not face the charges of a middleman called Exxon, or face the interruption of supply in the future.

So far, I understand from the minister that he has authorized Petro-Canada to negotiate for 100,000 barrels in addition to the 200,000 barrels already committed to Exxon and Imperial by Venezuela. I do not think that is good enough, nor do I think it good enough that the minister has not vociferously insisted that Imperial make up the 9,000 barrels per day shortfall that still exists in supplies to our eastern Canadian refineries.

The only way to counterbalance the power of companies like Imperial and Exxon is to have an effective and fully operational Crown corporation such as Petro-Canada. We in this party see a much enlarged role for Petro-Canada in our energy future.

To reiterate, Mr. Speaker, we in this party will have to vote against the three amendments standing in the name of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for the reasons I have outlined. I hope that we may move on to the other amendments that are before the House this afternoon without too much delay.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motion No. 3 in the name of Mr. Baldwin.

All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 3 (Mr. Baldwin) negated on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): This motion also disposes of motions No. 4 and No. 6.

Motions No. 4 and No. 6 (Mr. Baldwin) negated on division.