

Prairie Transmission Lines

to us about this matter. It would appear that the reason hon. members are reluctant to support these bills is related principally to the route to be followed by the pipe lines. I have been told, I admit, by someone at second or third removed, so I cannot guarantee that it expresses the opinion of this particular company—but nevertheless it makes sense—that this company would not mind routing its pipe line through Canadian soil if the other company which was incorporated last year were put in a position where it would have to do likewise.

I do not know how parliament or the government or the board of transport commissioners could deal with that situation, but if that is the position it does seem to me that steps should be taken to meet it. This raises the question of whether or not the overriding Pipe Lines Act is properly drawn in its present form. I sometimes wonder if it would not have been better for the government—rather than pursuing the course it has—to have brought in amendments to that overriding act. That might have been a better way to facilitate the passing of these bills.

I should like to quote a standing order, not as a point of order but just as a matter of argument. Standing order 97 reads:

No petition praying for the incorporation of a railway company, or of a canal company, or for an extension of the line of any existing or authorized railway or canal, or for the construction of branches thereto, shall be considered by the examiner, or by the committee on standing orders, until there has been filed with the said examiner a map or plan, showing the proposed location of the works, and each county, township, municipality or district through which the proposed railway or canal, or any branch or extension thereof, is to be constructed.

It seems to me that parliament is not being fair if we require from companies seeking to build railroads or canals a map showing their proposed route when at the same time we do not require anything like that from a company proposing to build a pipe line. That applies to the bill now before us as well as to any other pipe line company. Surely there is a close analogy between railways and canals on the one hand, and pipe lines on the other.

The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Murray) has indicated his support of the principle which some of my colleagues have enunciated, namely, that the line should go through Canadian soil. That is good. I believe the government would do well, in fairness to all companies concerned—if I may put it that way—as well as in fairness to the Canadian people to find some way by which it could be laid down as a basic principle that all our pipe lines should serve Canadian requirements first before being routed out of Canada. That is one of the main issues now before us.

Mr. J. H. Harris (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two observations with regard to this particular matter. I do not think we should be narrow or small in our attitude toward these bills for the construction of pipe lines to traverse our territory. However, consideration should be given to the elements contained in these products. The hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Harkness) referred to ammoniates which are found in these products. Canada is short of this commodity which is so necessary in our agricultural development. If these pipe lines are going to carry into the United States oil and gas which are charged with ammoniates then I feel disposed to oppose this particular bill. We must keep in Canada every pound, gallon or cubic foot of ammoniates which are presently here. Any hon. members who are farmers know that we have an abundance of phosphates while we are very short of ammoniates. Any move which will permit the taking out of this country of ammoniates in the form of gas or oil will in the final analysis be bad business for Canada.

It has been my privilege to investigate the pipe lines in Iraq, Iran and other places in Asia and Europe. I am trying to dream this picture through in an effort to see what might happen here in the next 25 or 50 years should we denude ourselves of this God-given heritage in the form of this element and let it slip through our fingers by way of these pipe lines in order to benefit our friends south of the border.

Thinking of the generations to come, I think that at this stage we should wait until we have more information about what we are doing. Let us know what it is all about. We should not go into this thing blindly. We should consider what Providence has given us in the way of natural resources and analyse the situation and then make up our minds what we ought to do. We should not make snap judgments. I should like to see these bills held over for a little while. We are a young country and we can afford to wait to see just what we are giving away by permitting these products to be transported through a pipe line that will traverse another country. We may be bereaved of this important commodity in the days to come.

I was amazed to hear the hon. member for Calgary East refer to the possibility of railroad lines following the pipe lines. As I say, I saw the pipe lines in Iraq, Iran and other points in Asia and Europe, and no railroad lines followed those pipe lines. No railroad lines will follow these pipe lines. There will be little development. But for