

Government Orders

for the millions of tonnes of grain that remain unsold, but it could provide a domestic market for between five and eight million tonnes of that grain. At the same time, it could clean up the environment.

The use of 10 per cent ethanol in an automotive fuel will lower the carbon dioxide emissions of those fuels by 10 per cent. That is the first benefit. It would also provide a means of getting rid of carbon dioxide emissions by the very fact that the growth of a plant itself removes carbon dioxide from the air. An acre of corn, wheat or barley will remove as much carbon dioxide from the air as an acre of forest. We are all concerned about the destruction of our forests, not only in Canada but in the Amazon rain forests and other countries of the world. So we could have a double-barrelled impact on pollution. I think the government should look very seriously at moving in this direction.

I am shocked to find out that the additive put in gasoline by oil companies at the present time in Canada to replace lead—and this took place a couple of years ago—is not allowed to be used in the United States. But it is manufactured there and sold to us, and here we are using it in our vehicles to further pollute the atmosphere.

The oxygen content of ethanol blend is almost twice that of other oxygenated fuel resulting in reduced carbon monoxide emissions. It could be as much as 25 per cent. I said 10 per cent previously, but it could be up to 25 per cent.

I should point out that currently the city of Toronto ranks as one of North America's worst cities in downtown carbon monoxide levels and most of this is from car exhausts.

Just this afternoon on the way to Ottawa, we landed at Toronto Island Airport. We circled over Lake Ontario to come in for the approach to the landing. We looked at the cloud of haze lying over that city, and most of that at this time of year has to be automotive emissions.

This government has an opportunity to expand the mandate of this Crown corporation into the development of renewable fuels, which will benefit all Canadians and here it is going to sell it off to the private sector because it thinks it can do better. Yet when we examine the dismal record of what has happened in the Arctic in the last few years, and currently there are nine rigs in the Arctic, not one of them drilling at the present

time, or as I should say as of early October and late September.

I look at the record of what happens under privatization, and I have to look at the Polysar situation in the city of Sarnia. It was established in 1971 with \$250 million worth of seed money. This is a very successful company. In 1985 to 1987 the government decided to privatize it and sold 48.2 per cent of its shares for a return to the taxpayers of only \$361 million. Yet, within two years Nova Corporation paid \$1.3 billion for that same company. The government sold those shares for \$5.75 a share and two years later Nova Corporation paid \$20.70 a share.

Then in May of this year the government sold off probably the crown jewel to the Bayer Corporation, a crown jewel that only in one year since the 1940s had ever lost money. It was a world leader in research and development and it was sold, to be gone from Canadian control forever and a day.

That is the type of thing that has been happening under privatization. The government has been selling Crown corporations at less than their actual value. In the meantime, somebody makes a bundle on the stock markets.

It has been indicated that seven executives of that corporation received about \$8 million in severance pay and then two years later part of the crown jewel of research and development, the old rubber division, was sold off to foreign interests.

It seems rather strange that this government is moving in this direction, particularly with the uncertainty in the Middle East. As I indicated earlier, with our reserves diminishing, the government should not be selling at a time when we should be looking to clean up the environment. Petro-Canada is a vehicle through which we can do this to work in the long term.

It is strange that we should be looking at a mandate that was pulled away from a company to develop the Arctic and the offshore and would allow ourselves to become dependent on decisions made in the boardrooms of other nations for the energy future of this nature, particularly when we have the harsh climate that we do.

It seems strange that we would rush to sell off our non-renewable resources the way we are. I reflect back to January and February 1989 when there were huge natural gas contracts made with the State of California and other companies out there. One of the American Senators was speaking to me about this. He told me that