

*Oral Questions***PETRO-CANADA****BENEFICIARIES OF MORTGAGE LOANS—JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-DISCLOSURE**

**Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Last October I asked the Minister through a question on the Order Paper for details concerning certain mortgages that Petro-Canada had on its books and regarding the beneficiaries of these mortgage loans. Six months later the Minister replied, saying that that was for the management of Petro-Canada alone to know and was none of our business in this House.

How can the Minister justify this secrecy when, under provincial securities law, private corporations must make such information known to their shareholders? In the case of "our" supposedly Crown corporation, as the ad indicates, how can he justify that we in the House are not allowed to have information which private companies by law are required to give to their shareholders?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, it is according to the practice which has been followed in many instances. For example, over the years many Members of Parliament have complained because they could not obtain, for example, the salaries of people who work for the CBC. They were not available to the public because of the competition in the market. Following that through, because this corporation is operating in the market, it does not want to reveal to the public information which its competitors do not reveal.

I will check the point the Hon. Member is making. He is making a very interesting observation that, under provincial law, they are obliged to do so. I will check that again with the directors of Petro-Canada. Personally I have no objection, but we have a Crown corporation which has to compete in the private market under the same rules as the others. If the Hon. Member is telling me that its competitors are obliged to do so, I will certainly find out why Petro-Canada cannot do the same.

**Mr. Andre:** If the Minister is to look up the law, it is Section 127 of the Alberta Securities Act; I do not know about the other Provinces.

**FURNISHING OF INFORMATION BY CROWN CORPORATIONS**

**Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister. Given what has been happening with Crown corporations—all these incredible messes which have been occurring—and given the fact that the Auditor General pointed out that Petro-Canada refused to provide information necessary for him to complete the mandate given him by Parliament, would the Minister not agree that it is about time for all Crown corporations, but particularly the ones under his jurisdiction, to have a policy of openness, and of making information available? Would he not agree—and he seemed to earlier; I hope he will confirm it—that at the

bare minimum the Crown corporations must live up to the standards expected of private corporations?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know the exact nature of the difficulty between Petro-Canada and the Auditor General. There was a problem about one transaction, but under the law Petro-Canada has its own auditors, like many other Crown corporations. There was one problem mentioned to me in relation to the acquisition of Petrofina by Petro-Canada, and there was some explanation given of that. I have appeared before the Committee where this question might have been asked of me. I think this is the first time in seven months that I have been asked such a question by the Hon. Member.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL RESOURCES****PROCESSING OF URANIUM—EXPORT OF CONCENTRATE**

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Could the Minister clarify the Government's policy concerning further processing of uranium in Canada? At the present time the Government is spending some \$200 million to build uranium refining facilities at Port Hope and Blind River. However, last summer it exempted a large sale of uranium concentrate from being upgraded in Canada, representing a loss of \$10 million in foreign exchange and many jobs for Canadians. In view of the money being spent for refining capacity and the need for jobs, will the Minister make a clear statement that we will require our uranium to be upgraded in Canada before being exported to our customers abroad?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a very difficult problem. Every application for export is reviewed by a committee of three Departments which looks at the advisability of giving a permit for export without refining or only after refining. Every case is looked upon on its own merits. Sometimes permits are given when we feel that it is in the best interests of Canada to export it directly, because otherwise we might lose the sale. As I said, every case is being investigated and judged. At this time there is a review of that policy. It is always a difficult judgment to make. We want to maximize refining in Canada, but at the same time we cannot create a situation where uranium mines in Canada will lose too many sales.

\* \* \*

**AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY****CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTO PACT—THREAT FROM PROPOSED U.S. LEGISLATION**

**Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. I appreciate that he has not had a chance to read the report of the auto task force, but he does know about the auto pact of 1965. Presently there is a bill