

*Private Bills*

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** Mr. Speaker, I have not very much more to say. Possibly these interjections may have made my mind wander from the subject. I do think that we should bring these matters to the attention of hon. members so that they can realize the importance of giving a bill such as this the very closest scrutiny.

**Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the bill and to introduce a motion which I think will give the house an opportunity to discuss what I think is a matter of great importance involving a very basic principle in matters of this kind. Before doing so I want to say a couple of words about the bill itself. I want to ask the sponsor, when he is winding up the debate and before we vote on the bill, which I presume will not be too long from now, to deal with some of the questions in the minds of some of the members of the house.

I hope that the sponsor of the bill will explain to us the necessity of a stock split when there are 40 million shares in the treasury unissued. The only reason we have heard from him is that the value of the shares is rising dramatically and therefore it is desirable to split them again. However, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), the shares of a great many responsible companies stand at a much higher value than do those of the company now under consideration. The explanation for the split does not seem to be reasonable or not sufficiently reasonable to convince us of the merits of the split.

We do not really want to hold the bill up in any way. We want to pass it and let it go on to the committee so that all the details that are in our minds can be examined and all the questions can be answered. We want to expedite the passage of this measure.

One of the first speakers this afternoon raised what I think is the key issue in the bill, that is, that companies of this nature should not be privately owned. That is our judgment and perhaps we may be wrong. It seems to me, however, that this is a type of company which should be publicly owned and should not be left to ownership by oil companies as at present. We are not in favour of public ownership in all circumstances but certainly any company that is dealing with a natural resource of this type ought to be, in our opinion, under public ownership. We have had good experience of public ownership in Canada with operations such as the

Sarnia plant, Canadian National Railways, and particularly with Ontario Hydro, a publicly owned corporation which produces electricity at the lowest cost I believe in North America, the next lowest cost producer being the publicly owned Tennessee Valley Authority.

It seems to me that at some stage in our history we shall have to take a serious look at the whole business of pipe lines. All the experts say that before many years pass pipe lines will be an important method of transporting goods. We shall not only be transporting oil through the pipe lines but we shall be transporting wheat and a great many commodities, even consumer goods. Many things will be transported through pipe lines. It seems to me that pipe lines are of such vital importance to the coming Canadian economy that the interests of the public would be served much better if they were placed under public ownership.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, rather than dealing with the particular bill under consideration I should like to move a motion, with your consent. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Schreyer):

That Bill S-10 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this house the said Interprovincial Pipe Line Company be brought under public ownership.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I point out to the hon. member for Danforth who has moved this motion that I can immediately see two objections to it. The first objection to it is that the words "in the opinion of this House the said Interprovincial Pipe Line Company be brought under public ownership" are quite outside the principle of the bill now before the house. Again, in the second part I would think there are financial implications. For those two reasons I believe that the motion moved by the hon. member for Danforth is out of order.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a provision within the standing orders for a so-called reasoned amendment which permits the placing before the house of a proposition different from that which is contained within a bill itself. I cannot immediately find the provision in *Beauchesne* that deals with this. I looked for it and I could not find it. I must say that the motion by the hon. member for Danforth came to me as a surprise; otherwise I would have had more time to check. As I say, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision to the effect I have mentioned. I am sure that the Clerks at the