

Energy, Mines and Resources

been able to show to the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, although I have shown it to his House leader and to the parliamentary secretary. I think it would help to make Crown corporations publicly accountable.

Before I seek leave to introduce that amendment, I understand the government has a small amendment as well. We are certainly prepared to give consent for the parliamentary secretary to introduce that amendment. I want to make some comments, however, with respect to the speech of the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, but before I do I wonder if I might inquire if he has a copy of the amendment I propose to introduce.

Mr. Beatty: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a copy of the amendment that the hon. member will propose. But I think there is some confusion. It is my understanding that when the House recessed at six o'clock on May 19, it was dealing with motion No. 3 in the name of the government House leader. That motion deals with the issue of negative resolutions in the House. I do not think my colleague can move another amendment until we dispose of the discussion on motion No. 3 currently before the House. It would be my intention to speak briefly to that motion if the hon. member has finished his remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Perhaps the Chair should recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Dingwall).

Mr. Dingwall: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is also my understanding that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway was speaking to an amendment introduced by the government and that he would continue his remarks. I will seek unanimous consent of the House to introduce another amendment later. I believe the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway will also seek the unanimous consent of the House to introduce an amendment.

As the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe suggested, I think we should proceed with disposition of the government amendment which is now before the House.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, naturally I am prepared to follow that order. Before I do, I should like an indication from the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe if he would grant consent on behalf of his party that I may introduce an amendment. When speaking to my amendment I intend to try to address again some of the points he made in a rather good speech on his own amendment. At that time I was not in a position to reply but I have had time to think about the matter and I have introduced another amendment. I should like to know his position on that.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is looking for an assurance from this party that at a later date he would have the unanimous consent of the House to introduce an amendment. I gather he is concerned that if unanimous consent were not given he would have to contrive some other way to get his remarks on record on the motion that is before the House now.

I believe there was an agreement among all parties that any amendments proposed on any side would be allowed and debated. On behalf of my colleagues I can certainly give the assurance that we are prepared to allow the hon. member to dispense with notice in moving his amendment at a later time.

Mr. Waddell: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I would never contrive to get in remarks on another motion! I am prepared to sit down now so that we can get on with basic matters.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I infer from those remarks that the hon. member has just finished his speech on motion No. 3, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to make some brief remarks on motion No. 3 proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) to amend the provision in the bill for negative resolutions. It provides that there be either a negative resolution or, conceivably, an affirmative resolution which would be the sole parliamentary control of the incorporation of these new Crown corporations.

• (1520)

I think when members of the House deal with this, they should keep in mind that the central issue is how Parliament controls these emanations of the Government of Canada. Ostensibly, Bill C-102 is designed to provide a framework whereby there would be some parliamentary control over the proliferation of new Crown corporations. At the present time it is possible for three public servants to go out this afternoon and incorporate a new Crown corporation under provincial, federal or foreign legislation.

The government's argument about Bill C-102 is that it would bring in a regime and system for incorporating new Crown corporations in the energy field. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have already expressed our party's concerns, and I intend to reiterate them, possibly later this afternoon, about this whole concept of giving the government a blank cheque and saying go out and incorporate as many corporations as you want. There is no requirement to come back to Parliament and explain their purpose or potential cost; just go ahead and do it. Parliament's sole control over this would be through a negative resolution or through an affirmative resolution as contained in the amendment before us right now.

Our party will accept the proposed government amendment, Mr. Speaker, on the ground that it is preferable to what is there today. As I pointed out on second reading, the negative resolution provisions are probably unconstitutional. Under the Constitution, the Senate is expressly forbidden to authorize the government to spend money. But the government, in the existing provision, would give the Senate the right to overrule the House of Commons. You would then have the ludicrous situation where members of the House would vote on a negative resolution and say to the government: No, we do not want you to go out and spend, say, \$2 billion to buy another Crown corporation. The House would have expressed the will of the