

*Private Bills*

unanimity and to which there was opposition in the committee of the other place. This fact should make it incumbent on us to search the bill and ascertain its effects even more assiduously than we might normally. There was a Mr. Gordon Blair, a local solicitor, who appeared for the petitioners and who, I am given to understand, carried most of the discussion in the committee of the other place. He was supported in his stand by Mr. Kenneth H. Burgess, who is vice president of Hudson Bay Oil and Gas and by Mr. Bannicke.

There were people who appeared before the committee of the other place opposing this particular bill, and those people were representatives of the Pembina company to which my friend from Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) made rather extensive references when he spoke on the bill a week ago. Appearing for the Pembina people were Mr. James Scott, who I understand is president of the company, Mr. Charles Crawford and Mr. A. Douglas Arnott. I believe the fact that there were representatives of other concerns who appeared before this committee opposing the passage of the bill should, even more than other circumstances, impress upon the members the necessity for looking carefully at this bill before we decide whether to give it second reading and refer it to our committee. The members of this committee could engage in an intimate discussion with the representatives of the Aurora company and others who may want to appear in order to determine the full effects which might flow from the establishment of this particular company.

In this regard, I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Chown), who introduced the bill and moved second reading on behalf of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams), did a fairly commendable job of explaining, from his point of view, the purposes of the petitioners. We are indebted to a far greater degree, I believe, to the hon. member for Vancouver East and to the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Smith), both of whom spoke on the bill a week ago and gave far more details of the intricacies of the corporate structures of these major companies who are interested in this matter. Beyond this, the house is not too well informed as to the full effects that would flow from the passage of this bill.

In this connection, I should like to refer briefly to a passage in the speech from the throne, without reading it. As you recall, Mr. Speaker, there was a very forthright reference to the fact that steps would be taken to encourage Canadian control of corporations in this country. The so-called baby budget introduced by the Minister of Finance

(Mr. Fleming) just prior to the Christmas recess also had this theme of Canadianism, as it were, interwoven throughout. One would assume that the ideal of Canada for Canadians was a part of government policy, and I think a commendable part. For many years we have been driven along the road toward foreign ownership and domination of our economy. However, the particular bill before us is not compatible with that ideal of Canadianism which we all agree should be developed in this nation.

Apart from the so-called Canada for Canadians theme which we are trying to promote, apart from the fact that Aurora is in fact dominated by United States interests, as was made quite clear by the hon. member for Vancouver East and by the hon. member for Winnipeg South when he introduced the bill, there is another facet of this particular bill which makes it somewhat reminiscent of that scandalous pipe line discussion we had a few years ago. I might say that my statement is the result of the scanty examination I have been able to give the bill, and without benefit of consultation with the individual petitioners because of the failure of the Senate to provide us with the information in a committee report. I should like to make a brief reference to *Hansard* in this regard and read some of the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg South which will illustrate what I mean. I am quoting from page 1127 of *Hansard* of January 17, where I find these words:

The condensate would be delivered through the proposed federal company across the international boundary to an extension of Continental Pipe Line Company's system which would be built from Cut Bank, Montana.

I point out that the hon. member is referring to a specific by-product which is involved here, and about which I shall have something to say later on. This reference relates to the actual connections, and he goes on to say:

The condensate would be delivered through Continental Pipe Line's system south to a connection with the Platte pipe line system in Wyoming and through this system and its many connections it would gain access to refining centres in the Rocky mountains and mid-continent areas of the United States which are at present not served by Canadian crude. In the early years of the project it is anticipated that the throughput would be of the order of 11,000 to 15,000 barrels per day.

I have had occasion to look at a map which I have here, and on which are shown some of the pipe lines in existence both here and in the United States, and I should like to make a particular reference to the system envisaged in this bill. I re-read the words found at page 1127 of *Hansard*:

The condensate would be delivered through Continental Pipe Line's system south to a connection