

Supply

They create needless markets to sell resources which would be better left unused. They finance governments favourable to their interests. They are power gone wild, power unaccountable, power which must be seen for what it is and broken globally through the election and subsequent co-operation of democratic socialists in all parts of the world. People must see the need for taking such a stand against these corporations which control such important things in our common lives as energy, information, food, finances—you name it.

In breaking the power of the multinationals, I have alluded to public ownership and the nationalization of such corporations, the very thing which is in many ways the subject of the debate today. Indeed it is established NDP policy to use public ownership as a tool for returning to Canadians power over their own economy. Basically, though, we are talking about social ownership as opposed to state ownership in particular. Social ownership is any form of ownership in which people themselves own the facilities for production, distribution and exchange. State ownership is but one category of social ownership which has been used and should be used more to overcome the injustices of certain monopolies such as automobile insurance, public utilities and energy resources, for instance.

We are reminded of the encyclical statement long ago by Pope Leo XIII, "anything which dominates the life of a community should be owned by the community". Just as important, there is a form of social ownership known as co-operative ownership. In this case not government but the people themselves own, operate and control certain enterprises. This is the form of social ownership I would like to emphasize.

I know I do not have enough time left in which to go into the subject, but I want to say that we in the NDP and those before us in the CCF never intended an economy in which the state owns everything. We have always believed in a mixed economy in which co-operative endeavour was just as significant as government or private sector activity. That is the truth about the political tradition out of which we come. That is the truth or one of the truths with which the Progressive Conservative Party has to reckon if it is to be honest with Canadians in the genuine debate about our economy which is so badly needed in the country. This motion is a political lie that contributes nothing to that debate. For that reason it deserves to be condemned.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie). I have been a Member of Parliament for quite a while. It seems to me that in the last year or two every time New Democratic Party Members rise to speak they begin to protest the fact that they have been accused of allying themselves too closely with the Government. They try to quote figures to indicate the number of times they have voted against the Government. But if we look at the record, we find that they have closely associated themselves with the Government on anything of a socialistic nature which falls in with the philosophy or the ideology of the NDP.

I listened with interest to the Hon. Member talking about free enterprise and public enterprise. I was reminded of his former Leader who ran around the country talking about corporate welfare bums, indicating that any corporation making money was a bum, whether it was small or large. That particular Leader of the NDP and his Party kept this Government in power for a good long time in a minority situation.

Mr. Keeper: Question.

Mr. Neil: I will put a question, but I understand this time allows for both comments and questions.

The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill talked about socializing Canadian Pacific. He is quite aware of the fact that Canadian National Railways for many years, almost during its entire life, has been a Crown corporation. Is there something magic about Crown corporations? Do they act any better than private corporations? Could the Hon. Member tell me why CNR basically operates in the same manner as the CPR? I have never heard CN officials talk about reducing tariffs or doing things to assist the public. They have been a drain on the public purse over the years. What is the difference between the CNR, a Crown corporation, and the CPR, a privately-owned corporation?

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the point I would have made if I had had more time. Under the Liberal Government there has not been a heck of a lot of difference between public and private corporations. Indeed, CNR was formally instructed to act no differently from CPR ever since 1975 in particular when Otto Lang gave that instruction. I was trying to point that out as one of the differences between the NDP and the Liberal Party when it comes to public ownership.

Take Petro-Canada as another example. We believe that if it acts no differently from Shell or Gulf, then what is the point of public ownership? Sure, the profits stay here in Canada, and that is not to be taken lightly.

Mr. Neil: What profits?

Mr. Blaikie: Far too much of the wealth exploited by foreign and domestic private companies over the years has not been reinvested in Canada. But Crown corporations have to be different in many respects. I would like to indicate just a few ways in which they have to be different. They have to be leaders in the perfection of occupational safety and health. They must be willing to experiment with different models of worker input and decision-making. They have to be more obedient to the laws of the environment and the need for industrial development to respect ecological principles and that sort of thing.

We do not have Crown corporations which do that. This is why we stand in judgment over the kind of public ownership the Liberal Government has developed. If Petro-Canada is drilling in the Beaufort Sea without the technology to clean up a spill, that is every bit as morally reprehensible as Gulf doing it.

Mr. Neil: I do not think the Hon. Member has answered my question. He talked about worker safety and so on. As far as