

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

PRAIRIE TRANSMISSION LINES LIMITED

The house resumed from Tuesday, November 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Benidickson for the second reading of Bill No. 119, to incorporate Prairie Transmission Lines Limited, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Church.

Mr. D. S. Harkness (Calgary East): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we had a considerable amount of debate in connection with whether the time should be extended at this sitting to consider this bill and another one which calls for the granting of a charter to a pipe line company. A considerable number of reasons were put forward yesterday as to why this should be done. To a plain man like myself, the thing that stands out is that the basic and essential reason why a change in the rules of the house was proposed by the government was a definite desire on their part that these two bills should go through.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Yesterday the house decided to extend the time for private and public bills. That is a decision of the house and it cannot be debated again. The question now is on the amendment of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church).

Mr. Harkness: I was not questioning the decision of the house, Mr. Speaker. I was merely observing that to one like myself who is not, and does not pretend to be, particularly well versed in the works of Beauchesne, Bourinot, May and the other authorities on parliamentary procedure, in spite of the rather fancy reasons which were put forward as to why that action was taken to change the rules of the house in this particular case, a thing which had not been done within the memory of anyone in the house, as far as I know—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must remind the hon. member that it is not in order to discuss that ruling, and he is discussing the ruling. I would ask him to direct his remarks to the amendment which is now before the house.

Mr. Harkness: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I was discussing the ruling. I did not think that I was doing so. As a matter of fact, I was addressing my remarks really to the purpose for which this change in rules has been brought in.

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, is not in order. It is not in order for the hon. member to do so.

Prairie Transmission Lines

Mr. Harkness: I bow to Your Honour's ruling, and I will say no more on that particular subject.

To address myself more specifically to this particular bill, during the debate on this bill and the similar one, the idea has been put forward by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) and others that it does not really matter how many charters we grant to build pipe lines, that we might as well grant a charter to any company that applies for the right to do so as long as they can prove bona fides and that they can raise the money to do so. I disagree entirely with that idea. I think that we in this parliament have a responsibility in the matter of granting these pipe line charters. If the general Pipe Lines Act under which we are granting these charters had not been drawn up with the express idea that it was necessary for a company who wishes to build a pipe line to apply to this house for a charter, and if that act had not been put through with the provision in it, then it would not be necessary for these pipe line companies to come to this house to secure a charter. But the act is through, and these companies are obliged to come here to secure a charter. I therefore do not think that we can adopt the point of view or the attitude that any group of men who apply for a charter should be granted it as long as they can show financial background for the thing. As a matter of fact, I think we must look upon any application for a charter from the point of view of whether the granting of that charter is going to be in the best interests of the country as a whole, of the particular area in which the gas is produced, and the area which is going to be served by the pipe line which it is projected will be built.

The purpose of this particular bill is the same as that of the other one on the order paper, on which I spoke for some forty minutes two or three weeks ago. I do not want to repeat the arguments which I advanced at that time against the granting of a charter to that particular company. There are, however, a few other matters to which I should like to draw the attention of the house.

Having regard to the granting of a charter to any company, I think one of the most important considerations is the route which is going to be followed. The sponsor of this particular bill, when he moved its adoption, at page 1344 of *Hansard*, is reported to have said:

I wish to make it clear that the passing of this bill does not in any way establish routes for the transmission lines for this company. As I say, as far as federal jurisdiction is concerned, under the