

Energy, Mines and Resources

private corporations. We should be doing that. There are some things we like about this bill. I have outlined some of them. We feel that the public sector has a real role to play in the energy field.

In many ways the minister copped out. Probably he was wooed with the siren song of Esso. Sometimes I think the minister is "Esso-teric".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rose: However, there are some things we do not like. I would like to outline some. They were detailed extremely well by the previous speaker. We object to the myth and the blank cheque approach. We object to the method by which they could create any number of new corporations and present them to the House without any further discussion. Is the expression *ipso facto*—

• (2130)

Mr. Waddell: That is what the lawyers say.

Mr. Rose: They should be ashamed of themselves. A separate bill is no longer required. A new corporation is not created the way Petro-Canada was. The minister simply announces it, and unless 30 or 50—I do not know what the numbers are, it was 50 last night and 30 today, I hope it will be 10 tomorrow—but a number of members must stand up to object, which is, in effect, a negative motion.

Does that mean that a bill comes here so we can proceed from its second reading stage to committee to examine expert witnesses? No, not at all. What has occurred is that we are presented with this piece of legislation, and unless many people object to it—when it goes to committee my party will move that the requirement for 30 members of the House be reduced to 10 in accordance with the Tory administration act—are we able to call expert witnesses to explain what is contemplated by this bill? No, we cannot. Instead of a five-hour debate, we will have a three-hour debate, and then the matter is finished. The members opposite will steamroll over us. They will have performed their function as voting machines in support of the government.

An hon. Member: To govern.

Mr. Rose: Those members cannot govern at all. They are voting machines. The 30 members in the cabinet are the ones who govern. Do not try to convince us that we elect a democratic government, because I know what happens.

Mr. Waddell: He knows very well.

Mr. Rose: The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. MacBain) knows very well what happens. What we see is a potential steam roller effect where future initiatives to be taken for alternative energy could be killed.

As was said previously, parliamentary accountability is necessary. We must have that because there are too many horror stories like that of Consolidated Computer. Even though it was not a Crown corporation, it made off with \$125

million. On my way from the airport I saw a sign on the street for Nabu Corporation which obtained CCI for \$800,000. It is worth \$125 million. That is an example of parliamentary accountability.

We have never needed parliamentary accountability more than today, and the minister has the audacity to walk in the House with a bare-faced grab for power to change the manner in which Crown corporations are instituted.

This government has certainly proven in the past that it is either unwilling or incapable of taking initiatives which I believe are very important. It is our party's view that the whole approach to the energy question, regardless of the established Crown corporations which I will not get into again, is quite simply headed in the wrong direction. We believe that the government is doing it all wrong and we have evidence to prove that.

I had occasion to be on the parliamentary task force committee which was set up by the government. We spent a year examining methods by which Canada might ensure its own energy self-sufficiency. Its recommendations were completely ignored, which is another matter I will come to shortly.

The government has certainly proven that it is unwilling or incapable of following through on any initiatives to relieve our energy crisis, even in the middle run if not the short run. I will give some examples to illustrate why I believe that. The government introduced the PUSH program with great fanfare. That program was the demonstration of solar heating technology in government buildings. The government announced in 1978 that it would spend \$125 million on PUSH over a five-year period. We are now into the fourth year of the program and you would be ashamed and shocked, Mr. Speaker, to see that it has spent \$23 million out of \$125 million. That is mere tokenism.

A year ago, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources announced a super-insulation demonstration program. It was supposed to provide grants up to \$5 thousand per unit to cover design and construction costs of super-insulation projects. It has been over a year and nothing has happened. The government is still negotiating with the builders. It has displayed a complete lack of action almost to the extent of being criminal.

There is the task force report to which I referred earlier. The report of that task force, which was under the capable chairmanship of the hon. member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle (Mr. Lefebvre), was tabled almost a year ago. The report contained 65 recommendations. I would like to read the guidelines which were developed by that excellent task force, which was made up of an all-party committee, including the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Gurbin). This report was described as little short of outstanding. This committee, cost approximately \$800,000, and not a word from the minister—

Mr. Lalonde: It was your expense.