practices and the bidding for the supply of goods and meterials and labour on this project. The intentions are spelled out. They all sound very well, but again the monitoring process is an effective parliamentary check on malpractices that could develop.

I wish to make a personal suggestion here, not as a party position. Perhaps the government might consider a provision in the bill similar to that inserted in the AIB legislation. Upon the petition of a given number of members, say 50, the progress of the project might be reviewed from time to time by a debate in parliament. That would at least accomplish exposure of any unfair practices or irregularities.

On the same television program, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands also discussed the gas swap in terms of the Alberta pre-build. There are two points of view. The one he expressed contained an inference that there was a split in cabinet. I think that is putting it mildly. I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member in the expression of that view, which is the way I understood it.

There is a body of opinion which believes it is impossible to arrange that pre-build without paying market prices now in terms of exports to the United States, and market prices three, four or five years from now in terms of the cost to Canada on the return of that swap. My own personal viewpoint, again not expressing the policy of the party, is that it should be gas for gas and volume for volume. In this regard I agree with the very sensible position adopted by the hon. member. I hope he is just as sensible in working toward the achievement of that kind of condition so that in the interest of Canadians generally we do not delay passage of the legislation.

Imagine the plethora of orders in council with which we are going to be confronted. Enormous powers will be granted under clauses 14, 15 and 16 of the bill. In the years of the Diefenbaker government, a gentleman's arrangement was made. The Deputy Prime Minister will remember this. Orders in council were to be tabled monthly, and they were. Since 1963, that practice has been discontinued. Unless you ask specifically for the tabling of an order in council, you never see it. Under the sweeping provisions of clauses 14, 15 and 16, we are going to be confronted with numerous orders in council that will not be tabled unless they are specifically requested.

I request from the government, if not an embodiment in the legislation, at least an assurance that once a month copies of orders and decisions of the board and any orders in council made under this legislation will be tabled in this House. In that way we will be informed of the manner in which the regulatory agency is conducting this project.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) will be dealing with the judicial features of this aspect of the debate. He will deal with clauses 16 and 23 at greater length.

I am sure the minister unintentionally misled the House. I ask for his attention because I hesitate to speak about misleading the House when he is not listening. He unintentionally misled the House when he spoke of the judicial appeal provisions in clause 23 of the legislation. If I read him correctly, not having had the opportunity of studying the release in his lobby, he said that the American legislation had similar provisions. That is not correct. Close examination of the American legislation will reveal they have provided that there will be a court of appeal. That court of appeal will be district court of appeal for the District of Columbia in Washington. But there is no limitation whatsoever spelled out in the United States legislation with regard to the appellate tribunal. They may quash, alter or confirm. They have the ordinary full powers of an appeal tribunal. However, as I say, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) will be dealing with that in a more detailed fashion.

• (2032)

I have dealt with the second stage inquiry, and I would now like to conclude this debate, as far as I am concerned, on this note. I am sorry I did not hear the intervention about Solomon, or whatever it was, and again I blame the electronic puppetry we have in this place.

I think it is absolutely vital to the Canadian interest that there be an opportunity for Canadians as a whole to share in the equity investment of this project—that is essential. That is what the 1956 debate was all about. In those days the shares were to go to Americans for something like $10 apiece and had to be bought back by Canadians at something like $40 apiece. That is why the government fell on that occasion, that great sellout of the Canadian position.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Nielsen:** I would suggest that the railroad spokesman for the NDP down there is off the rails.

**An hon. Member:** What about a used car?

**Mr. Nielsen:** I would not buy a used car from anyone in that government.

**Mr. Goodale:** Now they have derailed your train of thought.

**Mr. Nielsen:** They have not derailed my train of thought, for the benefit of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale), one of the few over there from out west.

**An hon. Member:** A growing number.

**Mr. Nielsen:** There must be that opportunity for more equity investment by Canadians. It was denied to Canadians in 1956. If ever there was a betrayal, that was it.

We have a shining example of how this situation can be handled in the manner in which AGTL was set up, where the citizens of Alberta exclusively, because the resource was in that province and the action was there, were given the right to participate fully in the equity stock of that company.

It is my understanding that Foothills from the beginning has said that all of the equity would be held by Canadian firms or individuals. This is to that company a fundamental factor in the presentation of its plan for equity to Canadians. I am also informed that the company has not yet designed its final share