

Energy Supplies

be a confrontation in this country. But I want to say to the minister that we do not want any pretence about supporting Petro-Canada. The Conservatives want to strangle the baby in its cradle, but I want to make sure that the minister and the Liberal government do not want to starve it in the cradle. Because Petro-Canada might as well be wiped out unless it is going to be given an effective role, and the only way it can have an effective role is to be the sole importer of oil in Canada so as to make sure of security of supply, to make sure that those supplies cannot be diverted to some subsidiary, and to make sure that the price which the Canadian consumer pays is a fair and reasonable price, not a marked up price that takes advantage of the world situation, such as we have today.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the last speaker, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), as I did to the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre).

First, I should like to deal with some of the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary Centre. He seemed to resent the fact that I introduced a motion of time allocation prior to his concluding remarks. There was a very simple reason why I introduced that motion. It was because we had been confronted in the House with delaying tactics on the part of the opposition which we on the government side could no longer accept.

If hon. members look at the record, they will see exactly what I mean. We spent four days last week on the report stage. That is an unusually long period of time. Indeed, we have spent the whole week on report stage and we are still on the report stage. There is one reason alone why we are still on the report stage. It is because hon. members opposite have talked and talked and talked. They have kept the debate running and they have not been interested in bringing it to a conclusion. That comes after three days on second reading and another eight meetings in committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Today notice was given of a motion under Standing Order 75c. I believe the time to debate that is tomorrow when the motion is put. It is not before the House today.

An hon. Member: The minister should talk about his bill and about the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The point of order is well taken.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I addressed myself to these points because the hon. member for Calgary Centre specifically raised them in his opening remarks and I think the House would expect me to respond to his comments. I think it is also of some interest since most of us know that this is not a new bill in the sense that its provisions have been before the House once before. I am referring to the bill which was introduced in

1973 and reported out in 1974. There is no substantial difference in the provisions here. This bill has been considered by parliament on a previous occasion, so that to suggest that we needed an extra amount of time when we had already dealt with the bill and there was much on the record, I think is just playing politics with the issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands raised the question as to my position on this bill and asked why I had not registered my position. If he were to read the transcript of the committee hearings, he would discover, as did his colleague from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), that I stated my position with respect to the amendment in committee and it is on the record. This amendment, as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands knows, was introduced, not for the first time, at the report stage. Again we are going over the ground. The amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham was dealt with and voted down in committee. Similarly, the amendment of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie was introduced in the committee, considered by the members and voted down. But here again we are going over the same old ground. I made my position very clear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The House has a right to do that.

Mr. Gillespie: I made my position very clear, that this amendment was not needed. I believe the hon. member for Calgary Centre quoted from some of my comments at the committee indicating why I did not believe this amendment is needed at this time. I believe that if hon. members would look at the record and consider the facts, they would realize that the government now has the power to use Petro-Canada in an importing way through the Petro-Canada Act, if it is needed.

● (1620)

I listened very carefully to the remarks of the New Democratic Party member to find out whether he was arguing that this particular amendment was essential to give government the power to have or cause Petro-Canada to move into an importing situation. That has not been the argument of the New Democratic Party. The argument of the proposer of the amendment was that this would feature or advertise an option, or words to that effect. We do not have to put into legislation words which would feature or advertise an option Canada has when we have already that power in existing legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am not rising on a point of order. I am wondering whether the hon. minister would permit a question.