initiative, limited initiative. Any corporation which is not controlled by the government or which has no authority over the public in a given area would be a private corporation. We do not know whether the proposed institute is to be private or public. There is nothing in the bill to indicate the nature of the institute.

The point raised by Senator Molson is a very important one. I suggest that the bill involves the establishment of a private institute. It has not received the approval of the government and there is no government control involved. We do not even know whether the Canada Corporations Act would apply. As I said earlier, the idea in itself may be a good one, but I think the motion now before the house should be adopted. It seems to me that the committee could study the bill at this stage and report back to the Senate that, if it were amended in a given fashion, it could be adopted. The point of order is well taken. I do not think it should be overlooked.

Senator Deschatelets: Honourable senators, a point of order has been raised by Senator Molson. I do not feel that this matter is of such importance that we should rush into it. I suggest that Madam Speaker take the point of order under advisement, for a decision on Monday evening.

Senator Austin: Honourable senators, I should like to speak on the point of order. I want to make two points in reply to Senator Molson, the first of which is that under the rules of the House of Commons this bill is described as a public bill. It is described as a private member's public bill. That is final on the definition of the bill. There can be no doubt it is a public bill.

Senator Molson: If I might make a point, we are not discussing the rules of the House of Commons, Senator Austin. I have asked, on a point of order, for a ruling in the Senate.

Senator Grosart: In the Senate, yes.

Senator Austin: May I say, secondly, that the Senate, by unanimous consent, has proceeded to second reading at this particular point and, therefore, should be taken as not being concerned with its own rules.

Senator Grosart: Where have you been?

Senator Flynn: In the PMO.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I shall take the point of order under advisement. Is the Honourable Senator Deschatelets moving the adjournment of the debate?

Senator Deschatelets: I suggest that Her Honour the Speaker take Senator Molson's point of order under advisement for a decision on Monday evening, if possible. For that purpose I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Senator Deschatelets, debate on motion in amendment adjourned.

• (1510)

PETROLEUM CORPORATIONS MONITORING BILL

SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from yesterday the debate on the motion of Senator Barrow for the second reading of Bill S-4, to require the reporting of certain financial and other statistics relating to the affairs of designated petroleum companies carrying on business in Canada.

Hon. Augustus Irvine Barrow: Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Speaker: I wish to inform the Senate that if the Honourable Senator Barrow speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill S-4.

Senator Barrow: Honourable senators, yesterday I adjourned the debate on second reading of Bill S-4 primarily to enable me to give Senator Grosart, and this chamber, more complete answers to some of his questions.

Senator Grosart asked whether this bill was the right way to go about getting information, and whether the government did not already have the information it was seeking. I am informed that reports with the proposed degree of detail and timeliness are not currently available from any other source, and, as I advised in my remarks yesterday, it was primarily because of the request of some of the companies that such legislation be obtained that this bill is now before us.

Senator Grosart made reference to Schedules I and II to the bill. If reference is made to clause 13 of the bill it will be seen that Schedule I refers to companies incorporated in Canada, whereas Schedule II refers to those incorporated elsewhere.

The companies required to report are those which deal in gas and oil—that is, primary production and exploration. It is my understanding that crown companies do not have to be legislated to report. However, Petro-Canada is required by its own act of incorporation, under section 7(3), to make full disclosure to the minister, and in any case it has voluntarily agreed to do so.

Senator Grosart is quite correct that the minister is being given the same powers as the Minister of National Revenue under the Income Tax Act in the case of suspected violations. I believe the phraseology is taken from the Income Tax Act, and is the same as in the Federal Investment Review Act, the Statistics Act, the AIB Act and the Petroleum and Administration Act.

A question was raised concerning the magnitude of the additional revenues, and what percentage of them the government would require the companies to spend on exploration. Of course, the purpose of the survey is to determine the amount of the additional revenues which are a result of the government's decision to increase the price of domestic crude oil, and to determine how those revenues are being spent.

On page 36 of the booklet, *An Energy Strategy for Canada*, to which I referred in my original remarks, there are schedules which show the distribution of the incremental net revenues