

*Prairie Transmission Lines*

that we gave second reading to them on the evening of the 29th and they received third reading on the morning of the 30th, the day the house was dissolved. There was not very much discussion on those measures during that brief interval.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Mayhew) has just advanced an excellent argument in favour of the amendment. He said that these pipe lines should follow a Canadian route, that Canadian needs should be supplied first, and then we should export our surplus. That is exactly what the amendment says. If those sponsoring these bills can tell the house that they are prepared to carry out the views expressed by the Minister of Fisheries then any objection we may have will be withdrawn.

I rose to point out one thing because nobody else has done so. I do not like to repeat arguments that someone else has made. On April 27, 1949, the other place passed on this problem to us. What I do not like about the business in the first place is that it is back door legislation. It is initiated in the wrong place. If you will recall at that time these bills were introduced, and Bill B8 of the other place, which was Bill 238 of this house, was the master bill. It provided for a capitalization of some \$200 million, and for the sale of four million shares at \$50 per share. That was the key bill; that was the financial bill. That is the company that is going to own and control whatever auxiliaries are set up afterwards. The other four bills that were passed with this joker did not provide for any capital at all. They were merely stock promotion bills. For example, Bill 240, letter D of the other place, provided for no capital but they are going to sell five million shares, and no par value is stated and no nominal sum per share. The company with the capital will get the smaller companies to front for them, and in the final analysis it will buy the shares of the subsidiary companies. The directors mentioned in the bill providing for \$200 million capital will own and control these subsidiary companies by buying up their shares.

That is not new. I presume the hon. member for Coast-Capilano has read Myers' "History of Canadian Wealth". Anyone who has read that book knows that this is the usual front for practically every stock promotion scheme that the country has seen. I do not like to see us not being smarter than that in 1949. Surely we should develop new and better mechanics of fooling the people. So far as I am concerned, I am quite prepared to form as many of these companies as possible because, as the Minister of

Fisheries pointed out, in the final analysis Alberta has the right to license any company that may be exporting gas or oil from that province. The more legitimate companies the province of Alberta has coming to it for licences, companies with the necessary capital and facilities to export gas or oil, the better it is for the province. Alberta will be able to differentiate between a company following a United States route and a company following an all-Canadian route. The final say is in the hands of the government of Alberta as to what companies will get that product for export.

Mind you, this bill is exactly the same as the other four I mentioned, which were put through in April of this year. There is no capital; the stock has no par value. They are going to sell a million dollars' worth of shares, but they do not say how much a share will cost. There is nothing like that in the bill. Bill No. 238 of last session was the master bill that takes over these other companies when they are formed, lock, stock and barrel.

I wanted to point that out, because all over this country the history has been the same. Railways were mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). Since this session opened we have seen the government of Canada taking steps to buy up the Temiscouata railway, and to extend another railway in western Canada. This parliament granted franchises to companies that did not have the capital necessary to develop and expand these railways, and after years of inefficiency, after dragging along on a shoe string, performing practically no service, the government has to spend a lot of money to take them over and develop them.

If we are going to do anything along this line the only franchise that should have been granted was the first one, to the company with the capital necessary to go ahead with the project and service the Canadian people. The sentiments expressed by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Mayhew) would have been more to the point if this company had intended to follow an all-Canadian route. I believe we should export our surpluses, and should not have to depend upon the United States to give us back what they do not need. If this line follows the suggested route there is no doubt the main valve will be in the United States, and we will just get what they do not want. I do not want to talk out these bills, but just to refresh the memory of the Minister of Fisheries, who made an excellent speech for an all-Canadian route, I should like to read the amendment again, because I want to see him vote for it:

That Bill No. 119 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this