

Prairie Transmission Lines

Leduc	Pouliot
Lefrancois	Proudfort
Leger	Ratelle
Lesage	Richard (Gloucester)
Little	Richard (St. Maurice-
Low	Lafleche)
Macdonald (Edmonton	Richard (Ottawa East)
East)	Riley
MacDougall	Rinfret
MacKenzie	Roberge
MacLean (Cape Breton	Robertson
North and Victoria)	Robinson
MacNaught	Rooney
Macnaughton	Ross (Hamilton East)
McCann	Shaw
McCubbin	Simmons
McCulloch	Sinclair
McCusker	Smith (Queens-
McIlraith	Shelburne)
McIvor	Smith (York North)
McLean (Huron-Perth)	Smith (Moose Mountain)
McWilliam	Stick
Major	Stuart (Charlotte)
Maltais	Studer
Masse	Thomas
Martin	Tremblay
Maybank	Valois
Mayhew	Viau
Monette	Ward
Mott	Warren
Murray (Oxford)	Weir
Murray (Cariboo)	Welbourn
Mutch	Whiteside
Nadon	Whitman
Nixon	Winkler
Pinard	Wood—152.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The question is—

Mr. Angus MacInnis (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Parkes), I too wish to thank the government for the opportunity of giving us extended time to debate this bill. I also wish to thank the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) who is not tonight in his seat—at least at the moment he is not—for my entry into this debate at all.

On November 15, when the bill was under discussion, he said, as reported at page 1806 of *Hansard*:

I might say the house has granted one franchise for a pipe line for gas in a western direction and a pipe line for gas in an eastern direction. As the situation stands today, the incorporators of each of those two bills have a monopoly, so far as gas moving in either direction is concerned.

I shall refer to that later. It is the rest of the paragraph with which I wish to deal now.

My hon. friends of the C.C.F. party have a good deal to say about monopolies, and yet we find them very busy filibustering so that the monopoly on the pipe line situation can be maintained.

I was quick to reply to the minister when he made that statement, because up to that moment only one member of this party had spoken to the question, and that member is from the south central part of British Columbia, the part of the country vitally affected by which particular route this pipe line may take.

Yet the Minister of Trade and Commerce was so anxious to make a point, a smearing point for the bills that he is supporting, that he had to bring the C.C.F. in as filibustering with a ten-minute speech. In view of the filibuster we had yesterday in order to get this extended debate, I would say that one filibuster deserves another.

As a matter of fact up until the time the Minister of Trade and Commerce made his statement I had given very little thought to these bills. Perhaps I am to be censured for that; but, like so many other private members, particularly those on the opposition side of the house, I have a great many things to attend to. I am not even like most of the ministers—and I say “most” of the ministers—who have only one department. We private members have to keep our eyes on all departments; and there is perhaps only one minister who does that.

Therefore we are very busy people, and if we cannot keep our eye on everything that happens or on all the bills which come before the house, then perhaps we are subject to censure—but at least there is just as good an excuse for us as the excuse the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) made for himself today.

When the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) spoke on one of these bills—I do not know which one it was; it does not matter, because they both deal with the same subject—he decided for me that I should do some little studying of the bills. I have told the hon. member privately that I think he made the best point that has been made in these debates to date, and I want to say the same now. He drew attention to two or three things which in my opinion are vital. He pointed out something, I do not know whether it is correct, but if it is not we should be told. We should be told in terms that will leave no room for doubt. The hon. member said that no matter how many charters were issued there would be only one pipe line built anyway.

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): Correct.

Mr. MacInnis: If only one pipe line will be built anyway, what is the sense of issuing charters? What value is a charter going to be to these people if a pipe line is not built? Somebody is going to have to be paid for the money spent in presenting the petition to parliament. Somebody will have to be paid for the cost of all the lobbying that has been done around here during the past several weeks. I should like to know who is paying for those things and how they are going to recoup themselves if they do not ultimately build a pipe line. That is something the sponsors of these bills should