

Petro-Canada Act

look pretty good for a while, but sooner or later one would have no groceries to sell and would not be in business any longer. The minister can say what he wants, but the basic record of Petro-Canada over its years of existence is that it sells barrels of oil in the ground which it bought from other companies and does not replace them. It is a one-way sleigh ride to a very bad end, if it sells the oil in the ground and does not use the proceeds to find more. I suspect that is what the evidence would show fairly clearly before the committee.

I should like to bring one other matter to the attention of the House before this bill goes to committee. A number of people in Quebec, Ontario and western Canada are increasingly disturbed about two specific incidents on which I hope the committee might hear some testimony. The first is that Petro-Canada is using taxpayers' dollars on something called the liquefied natural gas project and that it is commissioning engineering design studies to build the system. The word I get is that the technology which Petro-Canada is asking private sector companies to design on its behalf is 20 years out of date. I hope the special committee will call technically competent witnesses to examine as one illustration the management of the corporation and its ability to spend taxpayers' dollars.

The second concerns the increasing sense of unease in many parts of Canada that the giant they have created, Petro-Canada, is becoming a predator in the marketplace and that in fact that big company is driving out of business family owned and operated firms, not Imperial Oil, Esso or Shell. Some firms have existed over 20, 30, 50 or 100 years in the province of Quebec, for example. They are family-owned firms which supply heating oil or operate small service stations in small and medium-sized communities.

We must ask ourselves as members of the House whether or not we want to create with taxpayers' dollars a corporation which drives small family-owned businesses out of work. If we cannot answer the question in a manner which indicates that we should restrict Petro-Canada and not allow it to be the predator in the marketplace competing with small family-owned businesses, if in our wisdom we cannot design clauses to stop that, do we really want to move forward with making it ten times as big, making it ten times as hungry, or making it ten times as predatory? Do we really want to use taxpayers' dollars to drive family firms out of business?

I look forward to the bill moving to committee and to the examination we can give it there, if we have the will and the background knowledge to choose the witnesses and to ask the questions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1740)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. Before I recognize the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), may I deal with the proceedings of the adjournment motion this evening.

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Jelinek)—Automotive Industry—(a) Negotiations over importation of Japanese manufactured vehicles. (b) Request that Canadian content regulations be imposed. (c) Length of negotiations; the hon. member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn)—(a) Corporate Affairs—Uranium price fixing trial—Query respecting Crown immunity (b) Instructions to counsel; the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp)—Political Parties—Former affiliation of Manitoba Attorney General.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PETRO-CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-101, to amend the Petro-Canada Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Energy Legislation.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I just want to confirm that we are sitting through the dinner hour. I gather our House leaders negotiated that on our behalf, for which we can thank them.

I am pleased to open debate for the New Democratic Party on this first of eight bills dealing with energy security. We have a question which will be asked throughout the debate on the eight bills. It is this: Energy security for whom? In the context of setting out what we think are the fundamental flaws in the Liberal government's Canadianization program, we in the NDP would not merely increase the capitalization of Petro-Canada, as this first bill does; we would make Petro-Canada the number one oil company in Canada. It is not now. Dome Petroleum and other companies are ahead of Petro-Canada. We believe that predominant public ownership of the oil industry is long overdue. It is popular. It is what the people want and it is what they should get. Only then could Petro-Canada be the pace-setter for a fair retail pricing policy for Canadian consumers. Instead of taking this opportunity to advance the goals of Canadianization substantially, which I believe Canadians do support, and I tell the minister that, the