

Petro-Canada Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kempling: On division!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated on division.

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (for Mr. Lalonde) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Kempling: On division.

An hon. Member: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This is report stage and no debate is permitted at this stage.

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (for Mr. Lalonde) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of pain to the hon. member for—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blaikie: —is it Calgary South or Calgary West? I forget just where—

Some hon. Members: Everywhere.

Mr. Blaikie: —because I do not think there is anyone in this House who can match the capacity of the hon. member from Calgary for a kind of oozing, shrill, self-righteousness concerning the position of other parties. I can only say how relieved I am that we have come to the part in the debate where he is no longer speaking because it was difficult, I am sure, for anyone with any intelligence to listen to him go on about the nature of borrowing in the private sector as if the customers of Imperial Oil, Gulf or Shell never paid at the pumps or anywhere else for the borrowing by those private corporations and as if it were only when it came to Petro-Canada that such was the case. He demonstrated what many Conservative members demonstrate

from time to time, that is, a complete blindness to the way in which the private sector operates and to the way in which its costs are passed on to the consumers. However, they only manage to notice that when and if it is true of Crown corporations.

The hon. member went on at great, self-righteous length concerning the fact that the Conservative Party would like to spend more money on health care and would not want to spend all this money on Petro-Canada. He said that the Conservative Party would not want to spend all this money to increase the borrowing authority of Crown corporations, but would rather spend it on health care. We certainly have not seen any evidence of that from the provincial Progressive Conservative governments across this land. I do not see any inclination on their part to spend more money on health care. I did not see the hon. member standing up to object to the \$6.5 billion which this government will give to private oil companies under the Petroleum Incentives Program Act, and I did not see him standing up to say, "Do not give that money away. Spend it on health care." We did not hear anything about that. It is absolutely sickening, Mr. Speaker.

We are here to discuss Petro-Canada this afternoon. We will not spend any more time on the obvious inadequacies of the hon. member from Calgary West or South, or wherever. He is obviously from Calgary. He might better be described as the member for the oil companies.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Blaikie: It is a matter of public record that Petro-Canada was first formed as a result of pressure put on the Liberals by the New Democratic Party during the minority Parliament of 1972-74. The NDP put pressure on the Liberals to begin setting up a coherent energy policy for Canada, an energy policy which would see the interests of Canadians served rather than the interests of the private oil companies and the interests of the United States of America. Unfortunately, the Liberals have managed to set up Petro-Canada but have not yet developed a coherent energy policy which serves Canadian interests. They have failed to set up a coherent energy policy because all they have done was to insert Petro-Canada into an otherwise unchanged policy on energy economics and on the role of resource development in the Canadian economy.

This is true in a number of ways.

Basically, Petro-Canada is not the threat to private industry that my Progressive Conservative colleagues have tried to make it out to be. Their position on Petro-Canada is an ideological position. It is sometimes hard to sort out. They have two to three positions on Petro-Canada. We will deal with that later. However, the people of Canada passed their judgment on the Conservative position on Petro-Canada in the federal election campaign of 1980.