

Supply

The Member said that we allowed the Americans to come here and test the Cruise missile. We know the position of the socialist New Democratic Party about the NATO Alliance. Now they are trying to hide that policy and say that we have a commitment to defend the north. They are against armed forces in the north yet say we must defend and define our position in the north.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Come off it. We never said that.

Mr. Shields: They are having difficulty determining their own position. They then talk about drugs. We are the only western country—

Mr. Cassidy: You are sensitive. You are going down the tubes in Alberta.

Mr. Shields: Listen to them now. The socialists are speaking rhetoric, as they always do. Let us consider the drug question. We are the only western country that did not recognize and protect intellectual property.

The New Democrats say that we are allowing “those dirty Americans” to take over Dome Petroleum. Presently, Canadians own 25 per cent to 30 per cent of Dome. Amoco has offered to take over Dome to keep it operating and has said that it would sell off the same per centage of shares to Canadians. Now the New Democratic Party says that is not good enough, that there should be control of the company.

Let us consider the lumber issue. The Americans proposed a 25 per cent countervail duty on lumber going into the United States. We worked out an agreement and introduced a Bill that kept the money in Canada.

The speeches by the NDP are strictly anti-American rhetoric. They talked about Mr. Trudeau, the Constitution, and the Meech Lake Accord. Why did the New Democratic Party deny in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights that we passed in the House the right of each Canadian to own property?

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): We never did.

Mr. Shields: They were shoulder to shoulder with Pierre Elliott Trudeau because they are socialists and cannot allow individual Canadians to own property. The New Democratic Party betrayed every Canadian because they prevented the inclusion of the right of ownership of property in the Constitution so that all Canadians and their children could have the fundamental right to own property. That is where the socialists stand.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member said that there was opposition to the inclusion of property rights in the Constitution. Let me remind the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) that his Party has been in government for almost three years. Have those Members indicated an interest in entrenching property rights in the Constitution?

Mr. Shields: Look on the Order Paper. It is there.

Mr. Riis: We have been talking about the Constitution for months but they have never mentioned that the Government is at all interested in putting property rights in the Constitution. I can understand why the Member is upset. I would be upset as well if I was part of a majority of 212 Members that had 60 per cent of the popular vote in Canada but is now at some 22 per cent. I would also be concerned because we know that Alberta will be changing its electoral behaviour significantly as soon as the opportunity arises.

The Hon. Member mentioned the Dome Petroleum takeover. Our Party is concerned about the Dome takeover because it plays a critical role in the natural gas and oil industry of Canada. It is a major player in the oil patch in western Canada and we believe that it ought to be maintained in Canadian hands. The majority of Canadians feel the same way, as in the testing of the Cruise. When it comes to the takeover of Dome by a foreign enterprise, most Canadians believe it is not in our best interests and would rather see a Canadian solution.

We proposed a Canadian solution, which involves a consortium of a number of Canadian companies, including Petro-Canada, that be allowed to make a bid to take over Dome Petroleum and keep it in Canadian hands. The Government has not shown any interest in such a proposal.

Day after day we urged the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to facilitate a Canadian solution, but he is not interested. The point that must be made is that the evidence over the last two and one-half years leads one to believe that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Government of Canada would prefer a foreign takeover to allow Americans to run the economy of Canada rather than Canadians.

That is clearly where we differ. We have faith in Canadians and in Canada. We want a Canadian solution and expected the Minister of Energy to facilitate a Canadian solution. He did not do so because the Government does not believe such a solution is useful either now or in the future.

When it comes to Canada, we in the New Democratic Party prefer a Canadian solution. We believe a Canadian solution is possible if the Government would allow Petro-Canada to work in consortium with a number of other Canadian companies to come forward with a Canadian bid for troubled Dome Petroleum.

Mr. Greenaway: Mr. Speaker, is it true that the official policy of the New Democratic Party is not to sell gas from western Canada to the United States? Is that the stand of the New Democratic Party?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the seventh time I have responded to that question, but I will try again. The policy that the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources referred to was passed in 1979 during the second OPEC crisis, when reports from the National Energy Board indicated that the natural gas security