

*Adjournment Debate***PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION***[English]*

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE RAISED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Etobicoke North (Mr. Pennock)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—financial management system; the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan)—Crown corporations—corporation's undisclosed liabilities. (b) amount of liabilities; and the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Education—Student Loan Program—request for consideration of bursary program. (b) Minister's position.

● (1610)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[English]***PETROLEUM AND GAS REVENUE TAX ACT**

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Hockin that Bill C-17, an Act to amend the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax Act and the Income Tax Act and to repeal the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this legislation to do away with the PGRT. The PGRT was part of the National Energy Program. This debate gives me the opportunity to remind all Members of the House, but particularly Conservative Members, that contrary to a great deal of the rhetoric to which we have had to listen since the introduction of the National Energy Program about how the NDP and the Liberal Party were as one with respect to it, if Members check the record they will see that the NDP voted against the PGRT. We said that it was an unfair tax and all the other things which members of the Conservative caucus said about it. Yet, year after year after the implementation of the National Energy Program we were subjected to inaccurate charges about our blanket acceptance of the Liberal National Energy Program. That simply is not true. It may have been a very effective political tactic in the West, but it was based on something which was fundamentally false. The PGRT is a good example of just how false those accusations about our blanket support of the NEP were.

In debate dealing with legislation implementing the National Energy Program I said that it was a mistake to speak about western Canada as though it was a homogeneous political society. I said that because often Members, particularly Conservative Members from western Canada, said that the National Energy Program was not supported by western Canadians. Yet, there were obviously many western Canadians who supported elements of the National Energy Program, as

did the NDP. Many western Canadians thought the 25 per cent backin provision was a good idea. They thought it was a good idea to have more Canadian ownership. They thought it was a good idea to strengthen the role of PetroCan. The point I am making is that there was legitimate difference of opinion among western Canadians about the best energy policies for the country.

During that debate I was bothered to no end by the insistent claim of western Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament that only they represented western Canada with respect to energy policy. They assumed that all western Canadians were in agreement with their every utterance on this subject. That was obviously not the case. It is time for that to be acknowledged by certain Members of the House. Events in recent days have proven me right on that.

During debates on the PGRT and the NEP I often said that when Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament spoke about western Canada they really spoke only about a segment of western Canada, only about a segment of the energy sector which was congregated in the board rooms in Calgary and Edmonton. I remember claiming that the people in the board rooms in Calgary and Edmonton did not speak for me as the Member of Parliament for Winnipeg—Birds Hill or for others from Manitoba.

The Progressive Conservative Party's definition of "western Canada" was becoming much too narrow. It was preoccupied with the energy sector. It is not bad to focus on that and care about it, but the understanding of Progressive Conservatives of the interests of western Canada was becoming very narrow.

We have seen the fruits of that narrowness of vision in the CF-18 decision. The Progressive Conservative Government believes it is able to respond to the oil and gas sector of Alberta, but it is not able to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the people of Manitoba. Aerospace is a major industry in Manitoba. The people of Manitoba have a merited desire not to have it unraveled and seriously damaged by a federal Progressive Conservative Government decision.

This decision illustrates the narrowness of understanding of western Canada which took root in the Progressive Conservative Party during the debate on the National Energy Program and the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax. It was at that time that the interests of provinces such as Manitoba began to be excluded from the Progressive Conservative vision of possibilities for western Canada. That exclusion has manifested itself in all kinds of decisions made to the detriment of Manitoba since the election of the Progressive Conservative Government. An example was the immediate deferral of the VIA Rail shop which was to have been built in Manitoba. The continued delay in the ordering of the transcontinental equipment affected Alberta as well as Manitoba and I cannot, therefore, understand why the decision has not been made. Other examples are the cancellation of the manufacturing technology centre in Winnipeg and the continued delay of needed construction of the new Transcona diesel shop.