

Prairie Transmission Lines

and transportation of gas and oil including pumping stations, terminals, storage tanks or reservoirs and all works relative thereto for use in connection with the said pipe lines; and buy, or otherwise acquire, sell, distribute or otherwise dispose of gas; and as an adjunct or correlate to pipe lines for gas to have similar powers and facilities for pipe lines for the transmission and transportation of oil and the acquisition and disposal of oil—

And so on. It is presumed apparently that all these things can be done outside Canada as well as within its boundaries if we issue a charter. I know there are sharp legal minds on the opposite side of the house—and there is no sinister connotation associated in my mind with the word “sharp”—and they should tell the house what authority a charter issued by this parliament has once these people go outside Canada. Has this house any authority whatsoever to do what is suggested? With my very slight knowledge of law, and perhaps a little more knowledge of logic, I am wondering whether we are within our rights at all in dealing with this bill. As has been said so often during the debate, and particularly by members of the house from the province of British Columbia, if it is stipulated in the bill that the needs of Canada will be served before any gas goes out of the country—

Mr. Cruickshank: I am sure the hon. member will allow me to correct him as to one statement. He said that if all members from the province of British Columbia had the assurance of an all-Canadian route it would be satisfactory. I think he will agree with me I am the only member from this side of the house who has agreed with him.

Mr. MacInnis: We have had so little cooperation from that side of the house that I overlooked the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank), but I am glad to know where he stands. I knew it before but I overlooked it. If we have the assurance that the needs of Canada will be supplied before any of the gas is exported outside the country, we will immediately withdraw our opposition to the bill. To that end, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Jones):

That Bill No. 119 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this house further consideration of this bill should be deferred until the house has been assured that the route of any pipe line built by the proposed company will be laid out so as to serve Canadian requirements before any such pipe line leaves Canadian soil.

Mr. Church: I wish to speak on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis).

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. James Sinclair (Coast-Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have taken no part in this debate although I am a British Columbia member, but I wish to take part now as a result of the challenge hurled by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) a few moments ago.

Mr. Green: You did not have the floor.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I thought some point of order was being raised by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano (Mr. Sinclair). I submit that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) who was speaking had the floor and should be permitted to continue to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I saw the hon. member for Coast-Capilano before the hon. member for Broadview started to speak. I did call on the hon. member for Coast-Capilano.

Mr. Sinclair: As I was saying, unlike the C.C.F. members of the house, we do not consider it necessary to speak for forty minutes on every issue before the house. Our votes show the way we feel about these matters, and we are prepared to justify them before our constituents. On the matter of the pipe line bills I, like every other British Columbia member no matter what his party may be, feel that these pipe lines should be constructed through British Columbia if possible, for reasons which have been very ably given by members on this side of the house, members of the official opposition and members of the C.C.F. group. We feel that if these pipe lines are built through British Columbia it will give us a Canadian route, and it will be of great advantage to the province of British Columbia and certainly to the city of Vancouver to have the small interior towns of British Columbia have abundant and cheap industrial fuel. We feel that at this time it is most important in British Columbia to have the labour and employment which will arise as a result of the construction and maintenance of these lines in our province.

We are informed, however, and the information comes only from reading the report of proceedings in the Senate *Hansard* and in the Senate committee, that the cost of a line through British Columbia, with the market it would supply on that route, is so high that such construction is uneconomical. I say that neither the arguments of the members who are opposing these pipe lines nor of those who are supporting them are sufficient to convince any reasoning man as to the merits of the case. The only place where that can be decided is before the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines where expert witnesses, engineers both for and against the pipe lines, can be called and give