

Division

those who passed it. But as the situation stands, to a degree we are obliged to resort to a report by Stevenson and Kellogg, what a group of engineers in Canada said when they studied this question and so on. The members of this house are put in an extremely awkward position. This is the information that I have. I must accept it as factual unless it is shown to be otherwise because it is the only information we have available.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary South):** I wonder whether I might ask a question of the hon. member?

**Mr. Howard:** Yes.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary South):** I should like to ask if the hon. member would perhaps agree with me—and this is the point I attempted to make—that this is the advantage of having this matter in committee where this information can be produced and examined?

**Mr. Howard:** I would not agree with it at all because there are other factors than that involved. What the hon. member is asking us in effect to do is to buy a pig in a poke and to say, let us give it second reading—which is endorsement in principle—and then we will find out what it is all about. I am one of those strange types who believe in finding out what it is all about before we decide to do something. That is one of the reasons why it is necessary to discuss now on second reading what would lead us to this end.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary South):** What about third reading?

**Mr. Howard:** My hon. friend asks, what about third reading? I am sure he knows full well, especially now that Your Honour is presiding for a while, that debate on third reading is more restricted and confined than that on second reading. This has been the ruling given on a number of occasions.

I would agree with the hon. member for Calgary South that perhaps what we should do is to check the Senate up and express the hope that it would keep proper records of what committees do, especially in connection with a controversial matter such as this one about which witnesses appeared before the transport and communications committee in favour of the bill and opposed it. Perhaps we would then be in a better position to assess the facts. But to be asked to give blanket endorsement to something in the hope that we shall find out more about it later on is putting the cart before the horse. We might as well be debating the divorce bills which were allowed to stand a while ago.

There is one other point which might be cleared up. Although the hon. member for Calgary South is now fairly well restricted

from debating the issue, with his extensive knowledge in this field he may perhaps be able, by way of question, to clear up this matter. My understanding is this, and may I say that I am exhibiting my ignorance in this field when I say it. I understand that Aurora will be dealing only with condensate or what is known as condensate and as that is not classified as a gas, accordingly there is no need for it to appear before the Alberta conservation board. That is what I have been given to understand; I do not know whether it is factual information. However, there is on the record information to the effect that the company in fact has already appeared before the Alberta conservation board in any event. But that was one piece of information I was given, that it is not really necessary for them to do this because they are only dealing with one of the by-products rather than the whole range.

As I say, to a great extent we are devoid of factual information with regard to this matter. Private matters such as this, which have a great effect on the public and on the economy, should be seriously considered. I submit that these things should be considered before we give a bill second reading, and not discovered afterwards. Because we do not have this information available from its usual source—that is the Senate committee; and by that I am not in the least implying that the Senate is in any way inefficient in this regard, but we should have this information—I think we should preserve to the fullest extent possible our Canadian interest in this regard and have an opportunity to look further into this matter.

In order to ensure that everyone concerned has the fullest possible opportunity to look into the effects of this bill I think we should not give second reading to it without more detailed study and consideration, and I do not think the bill should be given second reading at this particular time.

In order that all of us may have the opportunity of investigating the full effects of this bill before we give it second reading, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), that the debate be now adjourned.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Howard) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Argue  
Fisher  
Herridge  
Howard  
Martin (Timmins)

Peters  
Pitman  
Regier  
Winch—9.