

Energy, Mines and Resources

laws as the private sector. Why do we need to give an unnatural advantage to Crown corporations in financing and provide them with a legal umbrella and isolation? Why cannot the laws pertaining to cartels, competition, intervention, and all other laws which apply to the private sector not apply to the public sector?

I urge hon. members of the House to support this important amendment, because I do not believe that any one minister should be given this type of power.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on this amendment which was introduced by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty). At page 17576 of *Hansard* for May 18, the hon. member had this to say:

● (1730)

How many instances do we need before members of the House, and particularly members of the NDP, are prepared to show respect for taxpayers' money, money which is coerced from their constituents?

The members of the Conservative Party do not help their case when they try to amend this bill, which I agree is a bad bill because of the way it deals with the set-up of Crown corporations, by going on a right-wing tirade, as the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) pointed out in his speech last night, against the whole principle of Crown corporations. That is the inarticulated major premise of many of their speeches. Nor do they help their position by saying we in this party are prepared to throw taxpayers' money around.

I do not say the hon. member who spoke last was particularly saying this, but I draw his attention to an example in our home province of British Columbia. A Social Credit provincial government, really a conservative provincial government, took all the resources of public Crown corporations that had been set up under the previous NDP government, such as BCRIC, the British Columbia Resource Investment Corporation. Its shares sold at \$6 and eventually went up to \$8. Now they are down to a little over \$3 a share and the shares have gone into fewer and fewer hands.

We have a situation where the government took a public resource which belonged to all the people, "BCRICed" it, and put it into this corporation whose shares have done nothing but go down. It has been poorly managed since they have been there. Who is giving away public money? I just point that out. Otherwise I agree with some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe.

Let me state again briefly the problem that we on this side have with this bill. We have no objection to the government setting up Crown corporations, but we do not see why it cannot come in and set up a Crown corporation by an act of Parliament. Surely that is the proper way to do it. Then after we had debated it, the Crown corporation could be properly set up.

Members opposite have said we cannot do that because it takes too long to go through Parliament. The answer is not to go around Parliament or continue the practice of orders in

council setting up corporations and do all of the lawmaking outside Parliament. The logical answer is to reform Parliament. You do not say that we do not have to reform Parliament and therefore you will continue with this kind of lawmaking. The logical way is to reform Parliament and then do the proper kind of law-making.

The other day I pointed out that if the government had not made an order in council amendment without parliamentary scrutiny of the Alaska pipeline act, 1978, it would not be in the exposed position it is in today over the pre-build of that pipeline. We could have had a full debate in the House and then sent the bill to committee to be looked at. Maybe it would not have made what in retrospect turned out to be an unwise decision.

Our position is that if you want to set up a Crown corporation, which we are not philosophically opposed to—unlike many of my friends to the right—such as in the energy field, there is a proper way of doing it. There may be room for an expanded alternate energy corporation, a conservation program, a neighbourhood energy corporation or an Inuit energy corporation to share in the Beaufort Sea resources in partnership with other Crown corporations. There are all sorts of possibilities. However, it must not be done by a quick order in council by whoever happens to be the energy minister on a particular day and gets support from a couple of cabinet colleagues.

I was only half jokingly referring to the minister when he said he was a socialist and that these are socialist policies. I said they were Stalinist policies, not socialist. Socialist policies would have a lot of reference to the proper working of a parliamentary institution because that is the way to go. I just wanted to clarify that.

I want to reiterate some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Regina West, who said that we would support this amendment, not because we are philosophically opposed to Crown corporations but because we want to make the whole process better. Ultimately, we think the Crown corporations would be better constructed and would work. Unlike some of my friends to the right, we want Crown corporations to work.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Those opposed will please say nay.