

would like it to be a monopoly on the industry. That is their philosophy: one oil company in the country. That is what they would like. It is responsible for 6 per cent of the upstream activity and about 19 per cent of the downstream activity. They should understand those facts as well.

They should also understand that it has a number of reserves in hand today that it wants to bring onstream. It is a very expensive proposition. This will allow Petro-Canada to obtain money in the capital markets, like the other companies do, to bring on its known reserves and to look for more energy in this country. This will allow this Canadian company to grow, prosper, create employment, and secure energy for Canada and for Canadians.

I hear members talking about the ideology of the Conservatives. I find that rather interesting when I take a look around the world today at the governments of all political stripes. Even the socialists, heaven bless them, are taking the lead in many areas. Communist countries and countries of all political stripes are realizing that governments cannot be all things to all people and are getting out of businesses. Mexico has privatized 260 companies over the last period of time. It is selling its telephone company now to the public. As a matter of fact, it is allowing 49 per cent foreign ownership in its telephone company.

In this legislation we have assured the people of Canada that this company will be controlled, directed, and managed by Canadians. Control over this company will be maintained by Canadians. These amendments today do absolutely nothing to improve the bill whatsoever.

For example, the Canadian Business Corporations Act, which Petro-Canada falls under, says that the majority of directors must be Canadian residents. It says that in there, and they are governed by that. This is already covered. We are assured that it will be controlled and directed by Canadians.

I tell hon. gentlemen across the way that sometimes it is to the advantage of a company to bring in directors offshore if they can provide good, sound, solid advice. Many Canadian companies do that.

### *Government Orders*

Northern Telecom is one of the finest examples of a Canadian company there is. It has R and D expenditures at 12 per cent of its sales. Its chief operating officer happens to be an American. He is resident in Canada, a very fine gentleman, and is very dedicated to this Canadian company. What they would do is prevent the company from getting some of the best talent available.

These particular amendments have been discussed at great length today. I am told that negotiations have taken place with the opposition, with the idea of reasonably debating the amendments that they have brought forward, because I believe they need to be debated in a reasonable and timely manner. But I understand that negotiations have taken place, so I am going to read this very carefully. I do not want to get caught like I did the last time. I give notice that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to an allocation of time to the report stage of Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, and, under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage of the bill, and at the third reading stage.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Essex—Windsor on a point of order.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to hear that. The minister has suggested that discussions have taken place, which, as I understand it, are a requisite for such a motion.

As the person who is responsible for this legislation on the part of our party, indeed no discussions have been communicated to me, which I would suggest means that this particular motion is simply out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Any minister can move a motion. I see no problem with that.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, which motion are we debating? Could I just have some clarification? A motion was just put to the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It was just notice. Debate is on Motion Nos. 2A, 14A, and 19.