

Petro-Canada Act

Mr. Blaikie: How many bases do they want to touch at one time?

An hon. Member: One hundred bases.

Mr. Kempling: Taking it out of the cookie jar again.

Mr. Blaidie: They take the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) off the subcommittee on foreign affairs and they put on the hon. member for York-Peel, who gets his view of Central America from reading journals from the United Fruit Company in 1955.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: That is what he is reading.

Mr. Kempling: At the cookie jar again.

Mr. Blaikie: I do not want to spend too much time, Mr. Speaker, on the right-wing element of the Progressive Conservative Party which seeks to destroy its leader—and will destroy its party, if it is allowed to continue. So I say, continue, continue, go right ahead, keep on, continue and take over your party. It is the best thing that could happen.

Mr. Taylor: Wishful thinking.

Mr. Blaikie: I was speaking about Crown corporations, that they ought to be more accountable to Parliament. We find a good example in Norway of how Crown corporations can be made accountable to parliament. Statoil in Norway has to make annual reports to parliament; it has to lay its five-year plan before the parliament of Norway. These are the kinds of things we would like to see. We do not want Crown corporations to be alienated, bureaucratic institutions, any more than anyone else. We want to see them become part of the community, part of our economic life, where people will have more say in what they do where people see them not as distant organizations but as part of the decision-making process and economic life of the community.

When we vote for the expansion of Petro-Canada and for the opportunities that this bill makes possible, we are voting for the idea of PetroCan that we have, because we hope that the day will yet come when we have a government that will make PetroCan the kind of energy corporation that will do a service to the notion of public ownership, rather than the kind of disservice the Liberals have rendered us over the past few years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. In accordance with Standing Order 40, it is my duty to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—Petro-Canada—Acquisition of Petrofina—collection of tax; (b) Canadian ownership charge; the hon. member for York North (Mr. Gamble)—Finance—Projected budget deficit; (b) Foreign aid expenditures—request for referral to committee; the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett)—External Affairs—Namibia—selection of electoral system; (b) Position taken by South Africa and United States.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PETRO-CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Mr. Cosgrove (for Mr. Lalonde) that Bill C-101, to amend the Petro-Canada Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): We had a rather full debate this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and I will not take much of the time of the House. It is important for Canadian taxpayers and for people who have been viewing us today, or perhaps anyone who has been listening or any member of the press who has been in the gallery, to take a close look at what the member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) said. Anyone who takes a look at it will see a speech written by a researcher in which the researcher laid out the wish of the New Democratic Party for Petro-Canada. There was one real specific wish, that it have a different board of directors, with people from the north on it and with people from labour on it.

Look at the transcript of today's debate, Mr. Speaker. The report reading stage is the time to move amendments. It is the time for a party to indicate clearly to the Canadian people and to members of this Chamber what is wrong with the piece of legislation. It is the time to indicate to the Canada people what you would like to have. What do we get, Mr. Speaker? We got a speech, but we did not get an amendment to vote on. How credible is a political party that says it wants change in legislation but does not have the courage to move amendments that would change that piece of legislation in the direction it claims it wants?

Mr. Taylor: Right on!