

They know that decisions on petroleum and the energy question change almost weekly. They will appreciate that a way out of the dilemma would be for a parliamentary committee to hold hearings across the country, as was done on the immigration question and the constitutional question in 1970-71. I think it is most important that Canadians have direct access to their members of Parliament in any discussion on the future of Petro-Canada, and this would be a simple way of achieving that end.

I will not take up any more time of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I hope hon. members will support second reading of this bill.

I notice that hon. members opposite treat anything that is objective or that tries to be constructive with ridicule. This perfectly innocent bill, which is a way out of an impasse, is treated with ridicule. When they give the matter a little thought, however, they may see that it follows parliamentary tradition and that it would be a good way to get direct input from the average Canadian who cannot afford to come to Ottawa to try to influence a decision on Petro-Canada.

Quite a bit of time was taken up with the point of order, so in the spirit of generosity in this Christmas season I hope hon. members opposite will quickly see the wisdom of sending the bill to committee.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I hope no one will ask me what this bill means as I am still not sure. I get the impression from what the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery) has said that if the Conservative party moves to change PetroCan, we should have some kind of a travelling committee, a road show or travelling circus, go around the country.

● (1720)

**Mr. Stollery:** I am right here.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Now my adviser is next to me, perhaps I can be straightened around. I want to say that I am not sure of the usefulness of the bill at this stage.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Nystrom:** The position I take, and I believe it is unanimous among my two colleagues and myself, is that Petro-Canada should not be changed. Any invitation to consider a road show where people can have input about the future of Petro-Canada is weakening the position that we are taking. Therefore, we should not be setting up a travelling committee to study the different ways that PetroCan could be changed.

I think the hon. member for Spadina is admitting defeat before he has even stepped into the ring. That is something Muhammed Ali would not do when he stepped into a ring, but the hon. member for Spadina has done just that. I am not willing to be that defeatist. I have seen my friends in the Conservative party across the way change their minds on many things these last few months.

**An hon. Member:** Name one.

### *Petro-Canada*

**Mr. Nystrom:** Someone suggests that I name one. The move of the embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is one.

**An hon. Member:** Another one.

**Mr. Nystrom:** We were promised a massive tax cut. I understand from everyone, including the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark), that there will not be a massive tax cut tonight. That is the second one.

**An hon. Member:** How about a third one?

**Mr. Nystrom:** In the election campaign, at least according to the leaflets of the Conservative party that I have here, we were promised that the statutory Crow rate would remain as a statutory rate. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) is now saying—

**Mr. Elzinga:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not understand how what the hon. member is saying relates to this legislation. I understood we were dealing with a bill that suggested a committee be struck by Parliament to travel across Canada to gain input from Canadian citizens as to what we should do with Petro-Canada. I cannot see how this relates to what the hon. member opposite is saying in regard to this specific legislation.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely right. I was totally out of order. I got into trouble because my Conservative friends enticed me.

The bill before the House is a little premature. In my opinion, there is no need to set up a travelling road show or a travelling circus until we see what the government has in mind for the future of Petro-Canada. For all I know pressure from the able backbenchers on the government side will once again force it to change its mind and keep Petro-Canada as it is. I am fully confident that that will happen. I know how persuasive these members are. I know how concerned the Social Credit party is and the influence it has on the Prime Minister of this country. The real power sits on your extreme right, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I think the hon. member for Spadina is being a defeatist. He is being premature and admitting defeat before we get on with the show.

I want to take about five minutes to tell the House why we should keep Petro-Canada. I will do this instead of talking about the merits of having a committee receive input from the public. There are approximately five important reasons why Petro-Canada should be saved.

First, PetroCan gives us a window on the oil industry. That is something I think is most important. As the House knows, the oil industry is almost totally controlled by five large companies. One of the problems we have had in the past is that we do not know as a Parliament a lot of what is happening in the oil industry today. We do not know about the impact of certain tax cuts or giveaways. We do know whether or not the oil industry needs certain grants. The only way of finding out is to be involved in the business ourselves.