

PETRO-CANADA

ACQUISITION OF PETROFINA—PAYMENT BY CROWN CORPORATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, I rise to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I draw to the attention of this House and the public the about-turn the Liberal government has taken in renegeing and defaulting on its 1980 campaign promise to keep gasoline price hikes below the 18-cent level. Already Canadians have experienced seven price increases, driving the cost up by about 60 cents per gallon. Part of this alarming increase has been caused by the \$1.6 billion purchase of Petrofina paid for out of general revenue, and costing approximately \$67 for every man, woman and child in this country. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson):

That the total cost of the Petrofina purchase not be paid for by taxing Canadians 2.5 cents a gallon on every gallon of gas purchased but that it be paid for entirely by Petro-Canada.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ENERGY

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON INCREASED GASOLINE PRICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Madam Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, and recognizing that the Liberals and NDP saw fit to bring down a government on an 18-cent excise tax on a gallon of gasoline only, while in just over a year the Liberal government has smuggled in seven price increases by the litre, thereby trying to camouflage a 60-cent to 62-cent increase per gallon on everything, including home heating oil, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre):

That the government recognize that these price increases are illegitimate, certainly unethical, and that it stop profiting from these increases by being the vampire of the consumer.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ENERGY

JUSTIFICATION FOR INCREASES IN PRICE OF GASOLINE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of energy. Yesterday the minister, without having the courage to come to the House of Commons with a tax increase, increased for the twelfth time in 15 months the price of gasoline by bringing in a 9-cent a gallon increase. That means an increase of more than 60 cents a gallon since December, 1979, by a government which campaigned for office on the basis of the following, and I quote an advertisement of the Minister of Finance which reads:

Vote Liberal and the prices will stay down.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1415)

Mr. Clark: It is interesting to hear some noise from a Liberal party that was silent through the constitutional debate, and silent as its leaders break their one promise to the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: How can the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources justify breaking the one major promise his party made in winning the election of February, 1980? Will he tell the House of Commons how, having opposed an 18-cent a gallon increase, he can justify increasing the price of gas by 60 cents a gallon, and going up?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lalonde: As is his usual practice, the Leader of the Opposition again managed to bootleg in a number of preliminary statements, to which I would like to refer. First, I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition was yesterday. I was in this House. I tabled a ways and means motion according to the rules of this House. You, Madam Speaker, ruled on this subject yesterday while the Leader of the Opposition was absent, recognizing that everything that was done was done according to the rules of this House.

Second, as far as the noise is concerned, the Leader of the Opposition seems to have his signals crossed. Most of the noise was coming from his side of the House, not this side, when he was asking his question.

The third point, and the main point of the question, has to do with the commitments of this party during the election.