

Mr. Kilgour: Do the Liberals?

Mr. Peterson: There is absolutely no question that every one of us feels it must be given due time and attention. When we discussed the budget we had opportunity to debate economic matters; as well as on various opposition days. Having introduced the budget, having it fully debated and having had the House agree to it, we are just taking one logical step to implement its provisions—the authorization of the necessary borrowing power.

Mr. Kilgour: Plus \$3 billion.

Mr. Peterson: What constructive alternatives have been put forward by members opposite?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Many.

Mr. Peterson: The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) criticized our economic policies. I should like to point to two of his criticisms. He said we have broken promises.

Miss MacDonald: That is true.

Mr. Peterson: We have never broken our promises on energy. Our promise on the pricing of energy was that it would always be lower than the price charged by Tories. We have held by that commitment, and we shall honour it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: Your commitment was that the price would always stay down.

Mr. Peterson: The hon. member will remember his comments to the House a few minutes ago when he criticized Petro-Canada and the fact that Petro-Canada would acquire Petrofina, so that Canadians from coast to coast could have their own retail outlets and could drive their cars into Petrofina stations. Does he want that for his home riding? Is he concerned that his riding will have Petrofina service stations? Does he not want Petrofina stations in his riding?

Mr. Crosbie: Petrofina is not there. We do not need them, and we do not need Petro-Canada.

Mr. Peterson: Canadians in every city which has had Petrofina stations have responded by giving them the greatest patronage of any retail outlet in the country. We are proud of that move. We invite hon. members opposite to join with us in supporting the move of Petro-Canada to bring the energy situation back to Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peterson: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) raised a matter of serious concern; that is, the allocation of time in the House. In raising that question, I think he recognized that we have a very complex and difficult situation before us. There are many problems of importance with which we must be concerned. I refer particularly to the constitutional bill and to the National Energy Program. None

S.O. 75c

of us have pretended that these measures are simple; they are important.

An hon. Member: Oh, hell.

Mr. Peterson: If the hon. member is indicating that the National Energy Program and the constitutional resolution are not worth anything more than a profane comment, I wish he would accord the House the respect it is due and read about those two matters. He would find them most enlightening. It astonishes me that hon. members opposite have raised again this question of the Constitution. Are they afraid they will miss this historic moment in Canada's development? They will have an opportunity to join with the premier of Ontario and the premier of New Brunswick. They will have a chance to join with the NDP.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peterson: They will have a chance to join with them.

Miss MacDonald: Crawl into bed with whom you will.

Mr. Peterson: They will have a chance to join with the people of Canada and to give the people of Canada what you and they admitted they want. They want a constitution made in Canada, with an amending formula and a charter of rights. That is what the people of Canada want, and we have the courage to give it to them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peterson: I feel sorry for members opposite. What will they say to their children 20 years from now when they ask, "Where were you; where did you stand when they brought the Constitution home?" We are talking about serious measures.

We have before us a motion to limit debate on a matter which has been discussed by the opposition. This is a supplementary aspect relating to the budget. We want an opportunity to discuss other important measures such as the National Energy Program and the constitutional bill. We will welcome the comments of members opposite. We will await patiently their concrete alternatives.

The hon. member for St. John's West criticized the budget on which this is based. He said it did not contain all the measures that were in his bill.

An hon. Member: Thank goodness.

Mr. Peterson: What constructive alternatives did the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton call for before one can introduce Standing Order 75c? What constructive alternatives did he present? I have not heard them. I have listened to a cacophony of gushing and meowing. They have asked for at least 30 new spending programs, in the face of a very responsible budget. The budget did not depress the economy by decreasing the deficit too much and it did not increase inflation by increasing spending the way the NDP wanted.