

Government Orders

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Ha.

Mr. McDermid: We gave the odd gibe, and I got the odd gibe from the hon. member when I was speaking as well. However I think sitting here whistling the American national anthem in the House is totally irresponsible and extremely childish.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to come to the defence of the member singing an anthem, but one of the great ironies is to have that minister who has been catcalling every speaker for the last two hours suddenly turning around and finding somebody else's behaviour bad. If he wants to set a standard then perhaps he can begin with his own.

Mr. Attewell: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment that that was not worthy of him or his party. Perhaps, if he is to continue with silly things like that, he might be more ably engaged in that other place down the hall where they had a great Friday.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): I rise on this point, Mr. Speaker. I am indeed sorry if I have distressed hon. members across the way. I understand that the distress centres principally on my choice of material, that in fact strong objection has been taken to my version of the *Star Spangled Banner*, although I note that in other instances that has not been the case.

However, if the problem is the song, I would cheerfully move to *Yankee Doodle Dandy* or *America the Beautiful*.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I don't think this point of order should lead to further debate. There have been messages hither and yon, and I again recognize the hon. member for Calgary-Southwest.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sparrow: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we have done a thorough review of individual Crown corporations. I would like to quote from the agenda paper that we followed and noted:

Although each corporation was established to serve what at that time might have been an important public policy purpose, we must ask ourselves whether that remains the case. If it does not, it is surely important to consider whether the corporation should be retained.

We completed such an examination of Petro-Canada and concluded that no public policy purpose was being

served by continued Crown ownership of Petro-Canada. We also concluded that the public ownership of Petro-Canada was not and is not required as an instrument of energy policy.

Today I would like to demonstrate in my remarks that the privatization of Petro-Canada will not put at risk Canadian energy policy objectives. It is quite the reverse. Many energy policy objectives will be better served by a privatized Petro-Canada.

First, I would like to start by recalling the main features of this government's energy policy. We have implemented a market oriented energy policy in the belief that the private sector, guided by efficiently functioning markets, is in the best position to make optimal decisions concerning energy consumption, production, and investment.

Consistent with this philosophy, the government has reformed the regulations governing the energy sector and allowed energy prices to be set by market forces. This government has also negotiated secure access to U.S. markets for Canadian energy products by the free trade agreement.

It has created an atmosphere which fosters investment, including foreign investment, while it ensures continued opportunities for Canadians to participate in the oil industry.

It was this government which terminated the National Energy Program through the western accord in March 1985. We deregulated oil in June 1985 and moved toward deregulation of gas starting October 29, 1985. The market forces set the prices.

• (1720)

Many questions have been raised about the possible negative effects the privatization of Petro-Canada could have on the oil and gas industry and the Canadian energy policy. Statements have been made—and I am sure you have heard them, Mr. Speaker—that privatization would impede the development of the industry, that it would put Canadian security of supply at risk, that it would lead to unacceptable decreases in Canadian ownership of the industry, that it would lead to an inability by the government to ensure environmentally responsible development of energy resources, and that it would remove an essential window on the industry for the government.