commercial agreement it was not seen to be possible to withdraw from that agreement. That is why the answers are in the manner in which I gave them.

It is the plan of the government presently to examine the role of Petro–Canada International and in a new regime, when Petro–Canada itself is privatized, it has been my position, as Minister of Energy, that I think it gave us an opportunity, along with CIDA, to get us involved in high technology areas in the developing world, other than simply food aid. I am not trying to deprecate food aid, but we also had a look at how could we expand the commercial interest of the countries involved. The decisions have not been finalized in Petro–Canada International.

What the hon. member raises is true, whether it is a Crown corporation, such as Petro–Canada, or a privatized Petro–Canada. In a number of countries we have commercial contracts for the purposes of advancing their oil and gas. Governments change. Coups take place, and human rights violations occur. The hon. member is absolutely right.

I find it difficult to see, once a commercial agreement has been signed, how we could then get out of that commercial agreement. The other point that is valid is, prior to those commercial agreements, what kind of evaluations we place into them as we make a decision as to whether or not to finance through Petro–Canada International any activity.

I am well aware of the situation. I am being somewhat cautious in this, but I point out to her, in looking at some work, for example, in a number of countries where we are involved in Latin America, that in a number of those countries human rights violations cases can be made and have been made by various international organizations. For us, however, as Canada, where we are trying to get involved more and more in Latin America, Petro–Canada International has been one of those vehicles.

The balance between the human rights issue and the other issues relating to influence and investment opportunities have to be balanced off, even though I think the hon. member made a valid point about the situation in Myanmar.

Mr. Lee: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing that the House will terminate debate very shortly, I rise on a matter involving an item unrelated to Bill C–84, but involving Private Members' Business. I understand that if I have the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion, which I have made known to all members by correspondence, that I may introduce it.

I would ask the Speaker if I do have unanimous consent of the House to introduce this Private Members' Business motion dealing with permitting the continuation of Private Members' Business through the sessional adjournment and prorogation which we anticipate will occur. Would the Speaker ask if I have the unanimous consent of the House?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to move his motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There is not unanimous consent. Resuming debate, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest who has one minute remaining.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, in the one minute I am pleased to stand again with regard to Bill C–84 and the privatization of Petro–Canada.

I think most people here in the House do not realize that when an oil company sells a barrel of oil or an mcs of gas, it has to replace it, and the cost of exploration, the cost of development and production is extremely expensive.

Petro–Canada is now in a financial bind where it needs money to expand and pursue an aggressive oil and gas investment activity. What we are doing here is really untying the apron strings or letting it out into the marketplace where it will be able to access funding and capital.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. It being 4.45 o'clock p.m. pursuant to order made in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) on Tuesday, December 11, 1990, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of third reading of the bill.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.