

voted Conservative wants it, we would keep Petro-Canada doing exactly what it is doing in the national interest.

It is my view that the Prime Minister is marching to a non-existent drummer. He is the only guy whistling that tune. The Prime Minister laughs. Consider what other countries of the world are doing in petroleum.

The government of France controls two oil companies in that country. Their aim is to control 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the market in that country. In Italy, the state-owned petroleum company has 30 per cent of the market in that country. The government of Germany is involved in a massive way in a large integrated oil and gas firm that is involved in petrochemicals as well. In the United Kingdom, even with dear old Margaret Thatcher, just two weeks ago the Tories decided not to sell off their shares of the North Sea development, but to keep them. That was reported in *The Economist*. The Tories there recognized in that instance there is a national interest in public involvement.

The state oil company in Norway is playing a major role in North Sea oil development. In Mexico it is 100 per cent government owned, and in Venezuela 100 per cent government owned. There is the same pattern, the same question of government involvement, in Argentina, Brazil and Peru. Indeed, in the United States of America, the home of most of the multinationals, President Carter in his most recent energy address over television said it is time that country moved toward a public firm in the oil and gas field. I repeat, there is one person and one person alone in the world who is out of step in the energy field, and it is our Prime Minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** We cannot accept the government's intention to break up Petro-Canada and have the private sector get the profit-making part while the public sector holds on to the debt-creating part. There is economic genius! We have a successful public enterprise and the Tory proposal is to give to the private sector the profitable part and keep for Canadians the debts. That does not make sense. Any businessman in the world, including those in Canada, agrees that it does not make sense.

I plead with the Prime Minister to pay attention to his own argument which he made earlier today. I listened with care. He said he will consider amendments and consider this issue seriously. I ask him not only to look at the long range future for Canada in terms of our very serious energy position, but to look around the world. Instead of breaking up Petro-Canada, keep this very remarkable Canadian success story. Encourage it to grow so that one day it will be the dominant firm in the industry.

I am not interested in the paternity suit issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition, although I would be prepared on another occasion to argue it in detail. I have no doubts about who would win.

I spent the last few weeks, as hon. members know, attempting to get an expression of concern from the people of Canada

### *The Address—Mr. Broadbent*

on this issue. I want to tell the Prime Minister that, as of noon today, there were 81,231 signatures in my office. They have been collected over a few weeks. We might have had more or we might have had less. I do not know the ultimate significance of that figure. However, I want the Prime Minister to know they are honest signatures, partly from lawyers, partly from farmers, and partly from members of his own party. These people are very serious about keeping this company. The Gallup poll which came out today showed that 75 per cent of Canadians, in a national survey, agree.

We take our obligation on this issue very seriously. That is why we are joining in a non-confidence vote against the government on this issue. We think it is of fundamental importance not only in the short run but in the long run of this country. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and this House calls in particular for the corporation to be designated as the sole importer of offshore oil, and for the corporation to open retail outlets to serve the people of Canada from coast to coast."

• (1730)

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is upon the amendment to the amendment. The hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse).

**Mr. Crouse:** Mr. Speaker—

[Translation]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) on a point of order.

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, I think we are about to live an historical moment in the history of our country. In my point of order, I would like to seek the understanding of all members. For many years now it has been the custom in our institution, during the throne speech debate, to allow the leaders of all political groups in the House to make their speeches right after the speeches from the movers. I do not understand why, a moment ago, the Chair failed to recognize the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Roy) who is sitting for the first time in this parliament, a man who was elected in his riding with a sweeping majority and who therefore represents sensible people, Canadians who trust he will work in the House along with all other hon. members and all political groups towards the healthy administration of the country. Yesterday I considered, and I still consider today, that it was our privilege to introduce an amendment to a motion moved by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Clark). I understand that it is an amendment to a motion and that the House voted on this amendment. I do not see how it could have changed the tradition of the House. So why does that happen on the second day?

Yesterday we talked about achieving some sort of harmony in the House. All members who took the floor yesterday did allude to that. Personally, I am in favour of harmony but it cannot be achieved unless all Canadians and all members of