

cal stripe, should deal fairly, and be seen to be dealing fairly with those interests, rather than simply going hell-bent, helter-skelter to privatization, and damn the consequences for we as shareholders, and damn the consequences of our employees.

[Translation]

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, could the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Centre (Mr. Cassidy) inform the House which Crown corporations will be earmarked for privatization under a New Democratic Party government?

And at the same time, can he—

[English]

Can he tell us the names of the industries already in the private sector which his Party is committed to nationalize, if the day ever arrives, which I sincerely hope it does not, that his Government were to be elected?

Mr. Cassidy: I want to tell the Hon. Member that I was in Edmonton just last week and had an extremely positive reception. It seems to me that things are opening up for the New Democratic Party, not just in the Province of Quebec, not just in the Atlantic Provinces, but even in the Province of Alberta. In fact the Province of Alberta was one of the founding building blocks of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in 1932 when, in fact, we founded our Party in the Province of Alberta. We are going to return to those roots. I remind my hon. friend that in the latest opinion polls the New Democratic Party was up at 28 per cent, and that is the highest we have ever been in our history. We are only 8 per cent below the Progressive Conservative Government, despite the disparity in seats between his Party and our Party. That suggests to me that when we talk about going slow on privatization, when we talk about the fact that the Government of Canada still has a role in economic development, a lot of Canadians respond to that and say that we are talking a lot more sense than people on the Government side.

● (1250)

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, if it is Tory policy to privatize Crown corporations that lose money as well as those which make money, what would the Tory policy be with respect to Petro-Canada? Why would they not use Petro-Canada to lower gas prices as they could, instead of dreaming about privatizing it? Will my colleague indicate which policy makes more sense to Canadians, the Tory policy to sell off every Crown corporation and productive industry that is owned by the public, or is there a more reasonable approach to Crown corporations?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up milk was still being delivered by a horse drawn wagon. The horses that pulled the milk wagons up and down my street in Toronto wore large blinkers so they could not look to one side or the other. That very accurately describes how the Conservatives try to run a public sector corporation in a creative fashion. They are blinkered and cannot see that Petro-Canada is now so large that it could bring gasoline prices down by 5 cents or

Canadian Arsenals Limited

10 cents a litre. Instead, they say that even though it is in the public sector it has to operate like Texaco, Shell or Esso.

The Conservatives do not understand that there is a creative role in the private market for public sector corporations. I am sorry about that. They just do not learn.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the New Democratic Party is high in the polls. Perhaps they will find that the higher one is, the farther one falls.

Will the Hon. Member tell us why his Party is filibustering this Bill rather than bringing the matter to committee where his questions could be answered as he examines officials who have made the transaction? He could examine the deal to determine whether it is good or bad. He could properly make comment there instead of holding up the House and this necessary legislation. Why not let it go to committee so that their questions can be answered, rather than talking about it here? It is Government policy to sell the corporation. The details of the sale could perhaps be changed if it went to committee. I suggest that the intelligent step for his Party to take is to allow the Bill to pass.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, let me remind my hon. friend that this sale was announced on December 2 and the House sat until December 20. We resumed on January 13 and have been sitting since then. Yet this Bill, which the Hon. Member says is so vital and important, was not brought up for debate in the House of Commons until February 25. It is impossible for the New Democratic Party to filibuster a Bill that is not before the House for debate. Members of my Party did not comment in the House about this Bill for two and a half months. We had no opportunity to do so because the Bill was not before us for debate.

If my hon. friend is taking part in the legislative committee dealing with this Bill, will he assure us that we will not be subjected to the kind of deadlines that closed off discussion on the Bill dealing with de Havilland? If he could give us that assurance I am sure it would enable us to expedite the determination of this Bill.

Discussion on this Bill has consisted of a morning, an afternoon and a morning of debate. I suggest that does not amount to a filibuster when we are discussing a \$90 million Bill. Furthermore, let me state for the record that I believe I am the fourth member of my Party to speak on this Bill, and I suggest that is far from a filibuster.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding from the debate that Canadian Arsenals Limited sells its products to the Canadian Armed Forces and its NATO allies. I also understand from answers by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) that some of the products of Canadian Arsenals Limited have found their way to Chile, that escutcheon in South America. It has been able to purchase some of the products of Canadian Arsenals even though that company is owned by the Canadian Government. Some of its products have found their way into Chile, that bastion of democracy