

Petro-Canada Act

That is the realistic program. Idealism, in the negative sense of idealism, means illusion, and in that sense the idealists are those, like many on my right and indeed many across the way, who think we can go on as we are doing now. They are the ones who are not being realistic.

We in the New Democratic Party would like to see Petro-Can, and for that matter all Crown corporations, set up differently. The present PetroCan board of directors should be replaced with a board of directors selected equally from the north, from environmental organizations, from business, labour, religious groups, consumer groups and other public interest groups. Perhaps the board of directors could be renamed the board of stewards as a way of saying what we want PetroCan to become.

PetroCan and other Crown corporations should be more responsible and accountable to Parliament. Instead we find the Liberals moving even more toward bureaucratic authoritarianism of these issues by wanting to give themselves power to set up new energy corporations without parliamentary approval. In Bill C-102, they want to set up new energy corporations without even coming to Parliament, with no parliamentary debate. We have seen too much of this here. The Progressive Conservatives yelp a lot about it. But in 1980 it was the New Democratic Party which took the Liberals to task for doing something for which it did not have parliamentary approval. That was to build the southern portion of the Alaska gas pipeline. The NDP stood up to the Liberals. The Progressive Conservatives voted with them to do that for which they did not have parliamentary approval. They should think about that the next time they get up and start waxing self-righteous about what the Liberals are doing to Parliament.

Mr. Taylor: Who supported them in property rights?

Mr. Blaikie: The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) mentions property rights. That is another way the Progressive Conservatives have of telling only half the truth all the time. They talk about the NDP opposition, including property rights, in the Constitution. They do not talk about all the Progressive Conservative premiers who did not want property rights in the Constitution. You will never, as long as you live, hear that coming out of the mouth of the hon. member for Bow River. He just likes to stick to the portion of the truth that suits his fantasies.

Mr. Taylor: Who took it out of the charter?

Mr. Blaikie: Having noted the division between the hon. member for Bow River and the Progressive Conservative premiers in this country, maybe it is time to say a bit more about the ideological chaos in the Progressive Conservative Party. This is something which bears on the debate this afternoon. I would like to know who speaks for the Progressive Conservative Party on some of these issues.

• (1650)

Mr. Taylor: We all do.

Mr. Broadbent: Right on!

Mr. Blaikie: That is the problem, Mr. Speaker. They all do. It is the greatest cacophony and confusion one could imagine because we have, on the one hand, Robert Stanfield saying, "Do not forget the old Tory tradition of the appropriate, positive role of government in the economy," and then we have the member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) thinking that anything that smacks of having at least one Crown corporation exist, still existing, that this is part of the creeping communist conspiracy. Who is speaking for the Conservative Party? Is it Mr. Stanfield or is it the member for York-Peel?

Mr. Broadbent: "We all do."

Mr. Blaikie: Has the Conservative Party been so infiltrated by American neo-conservatives that they cannot even see the value of Crown corporations any more?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blaikie: It is a terrible thing to see them go down the tube like this. Who speaks for the Progressive Conservative Party on foreign affairs?

Mr. Kempling: What about Saskatchewan?

Mr. Broadbent: What about Manitoba?

Mr. Taylor: Where is Allan Blakeney today?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The debate is hardly dealing with foreign affairs at this stage. The hon. member might stay with the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. Blaikie: I was trying to address what I consider to be a general malaise within the Progressive Conservative Party, and which I think bears on their approach to PetroCan. There are many people, at least I like to think there are, who are not as against Petro-Canada as some of their more right wing ideological friends try to make the party out to be. At least we hope that is the case. We have no indication of it, because they have two or three different positions on PetroCan. Why do they not have the guts to come out and say they do not like PetroCan? Why they do not go right across the country and say that? Of course, they did, Mr. Speaker, and they lost the election. That is what happened.

I was speaking about the ideological malaise within my colleagues to the right. I mentioned foreign affairs only as an analogy to what I am talking about when it comes to Petro-Can, and therefore I think it relevant, Mr. Speaker.

We have two different factions speaking for the Progressive Conservative Party all the time. Who speaks for them on foreign affairs? Is it the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean), or is the hon. member for York-Peel, or is it the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald)? What is going on here? Who speaks on foreign affairs?

Mr. Broadbent: They all do.