

Government Orders

Even more recently we have seen threats to our social programs: Unemployment Insurance Act amendments that would penalize our breadwinners, the clawback that would penalize our seniors, child benefit program cuts which were made, and even now the threat to medicare.

What does Petro-Canada reflect? It reflects public policy, Canadianism, and Canadian values. What are these values? Canadian ownership and control of the oil industry grew from 1980 to 1985. Three events at the time allowed it to happen. The key is that we have assumed Canadian ownership and control of our energy supply.

The second value is about security of energy supply. Canada is one of the fortunate countries in the world to have a wide range of conventional and renewable energy sources that it can call upon for its energy needs. We believe Petro-Canada is our only remaining energy lever against big, foreign owned energy multinationals.

Today we are facing a crisis in the oil industry due to the crisis in the gulf. We cannot leave things to chance. We must take control of our resources for the benefit of our nation, for the benefit of our future generation. We believe that Petro-Canada serves us as a useful instrument, as a useful insurance. As a national company it has played a vital role in state to state negotiations during periods of uncertainty in the world oil trade as we are now facing. Yes, Petro-Canada has a bright future for us to play as a public corporation. It could play a leading role in the ongoing growth of our nation. It has done an excellent job in the past. We should allow it to continue with the job. Canadians need a voice in the energy industry, and the answer is continuing public ownership of Petro-Canada.

In the remaining couple of minutes, I would like to speak about the process of time allocation. The member for Kingston and the Islands has kindly provided me with information that since May 1985, 31 attempts have been made by this government to impose time allocation. The success rate of this government in so far as time allocation is concerned has been great. It succeeded in 25 times out of 31 in moving time allocation, about 4.6 per year on the average, while the Liberal record on this

note was only about 1.5 a year in the many years a Liberal government has served this country.

When one considers the many events in parliamentary debate during which time this government moved time allocation they concerned vital programs such as family allowances, employment equity, government expenditures, and today Petro-Canada.

As I look back at the problem before us, I would like to quote from the historical summary of Standing Order 78 which governs this particular motion:

From the early years of the Canadian Parliament, it was recognized that complete freedom of debate was impossible and that some restraint would have to be exercised or some accommodation reached in order for the House to conduct its business within a reasonable time frame.

This quotation is from the *Annotated Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, 1989 Edition. The key words I would like to call to the attention of the House are: "within a reasonable time frame". I submit that we have not been provided with reasonable time for debate of this particular bill in this House. I know there is always a continuing conflict, a continuing competition between the role of the majority and the role of the minority. The real challenge to the majority is to see the hearts of the minority because the minority in this Parliament represents the majority of Canadians across the country.

As I conclude my debate on this issue, let me just say that yes, we are opposed to the privatization of Petro-Canada. The Liberal Party believes that it ought to continue as a national institution. We are equally opposed that the guillotine of time allocation has been imposed on this debate so that Canadians from across the country shall not be heard.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It being 3.21 o'clock p.m., the two hours provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House, under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), have expired.

[*Translation*]

Accordingly, pursuant to the Standing Orders, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.