

*Prairie Transmission Lines*

members of parliament actual and not *ipse dixit* information. For that reason I, as a British Columbia member who yields to none in devotion to my province, say that I will vote for the bills on second reading if only to get them where they can be properly studied in committee. Unless very sound reasons are given in the committee why construction through B.C. is uneconomic I will vote against the bills on their return to the house.

I say I resent the challenges and slurs flung out by the C.C.F. that just because we do not speak on every issue we are not interested in every issue. Somehow or other the business of the house has to be conducted, and I submit that members' votes in themselves are sufficient indication to most people of where they stand. There is one other point. Last spring in the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines I was the one who actually conducted the cross-examination of the representatives of the Westcoast Transmission Company which was then proposing to build an all-Canadian route through British Columbia and got their charter because of this route. I have heard with some dismay that this company, which has been referred to as an all-Canadian company, has now, according to two hon. members of the house, filed an application to build a route through the United States exactly similar to the routes which are now under discussion.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary West):** Utter nonsense.

**Mr. Sinclair:** All I can say is that the statement was made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Goode), and it has not been contradicted.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary West):** I contradict it now. It is absolute nonsense.

**Mr. Sinclair:** I am glad to hear that, but it does not alter my submission. I want to tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker. My opposition to filibustering does not date only from this session. I remember another session, when members of the opposition were filibustering a public bill I was sponsoring, the one on margarine, and at that time there did not seem to be the same indignation against obstruction. I do not want to be held up as obstructing these bills, so I am going to conclude my remarks; but I say they should get second reading and go to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, if only to give the members of this house and the people of Canada knowledge of the facts rather than the opinions of members of parliament, many of whom obviously have very little knowledge of the engineering problems involved.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

**Mr. T. L. Church (Broadview):** I rise to support the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) and seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Jones). The amendment asks that this bill be not now read a second time but that further consideration be deferred until the house has been assured that the route of any pipe line built by the proposed company will be so laid out as to serve Canadian requirements before any such pipe line leaves Canadian soil. In my opinion that is a very good resolution.

The other day in this house we were referring to similar proposals, and the only two hon. members from British Columbia who spoke in favour of those were the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Murray) and the member for one of the Vancouver island seats. That member is a graduate of the university of British Columbia, a very likable young gentleman whom I have known for many years. On the other hand the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) has expressed strong objection to giving away the natural resources of this country.

We have seen some of the effects of giving away the vast natural heritage in which the people of Canada have taken such pride in years past. It seems that most of those who have spoken in support of this bill have come from Manitoba and Ontario. Ever since I have been a member of this house this principle has been under discussion. I came here in the early twenties, when we were suffering from severe unemployment following the first war. At that time we experienced some of the results of giving away our natural resources; we saw how it affected trade and commerce and industry. We have become largely an industrial nation; but with the unemployment that followed the first war it became more and more necessary for us to conserve and develop our natural resources for our own benefit. This house has declared itself on several occasions on the question of giving away our great resources, such as our forests, in return for mere trifles. That is one reason why within a short time this country may be suffering from a depression. We are sure to run into one very shortly; that is the opinion expressed in a great many financial textbooks, and many leading economists have also sounded that warning. That is the fate which awaits this country unless it wakes up and develops its natural resources for the benefit of all the people.

After all is said and done, who own these natural resources? They were given by Providence for the development of this country. We have great admiration and respect for our neighbour to the south, which has