

*Prairie Transmission Lines*

link, between the government and the electors. When he ceases, the functions of parliamentary government are at an end. That is what happens—it is the end. When we are asked to vote away our resources in this way, we are voting to hamstring parliament.

The other day I met an old friend from Fort William (Mr. McIvor) on the elevator in this building and was complimenting him upon his effort in the house, when he had objected to someone suggesting that he was only a rubber stamp. I said he showed spirit which would have served him well in a boxing bout, and I nominated the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith), who is known as a sport, to act as judge. I thought he would look after our beloved clergyman over there, in that corner, with our men over here in this corner, and the hon. member for Calgary West would be the judge. Perhaps I should not say much more about the hon. member for Fort William, because he is not in his seat tonight. I do say about him however that he is a fine sportsman, and I have known him a long time.

Let me say in conclusion that this bill should have been considered by the committee on private bills. We used to have some rights and privileges in parliament, when I first came here. I doubt very much that anyone now seeks the privilege of becoming a member. What is the use, I ask? We are just wasting our time. We have no power; our functions, rights and privileges have been taken away from us. We are losing our rights; we are losing employment; we are losing industry; we are losing trade and commerce; we are attempting to develop somebody else's property at the expense of the Canadian people.

For those reasons I object to this proposal to hand over our rights, functions and privileges to somebody else. And I will say this to the private members, that many of them come from municipalities. I am glad to see them here. Those men who contest municipal elections are closer to the people than are members of the federal government.

A rule was placed on the Ontario statute books whereby no franchise could be given away in any municipality of Ontario without first having a vote of the people. That was a good and sensible proviso. I doubt if we would ever have owned our own street car systems, or our power and hydro electric developments if that had not been the law of the land in Ontario. Had it not been we would not own the Toronto transportation commission, and would not have any street cars to travel to that magnificent winter fair. In Ontario we do not hand out franchises in a haphazard way.

[Mr. Church.]

There is no control over these pipe line routes. I call it a pipe dream act, and that is what it is—just a pipe dream act. It hands out other people's property—and to whom? It hands it out to every Tom, Dick and Harry who wants to have it. Definitely that it not the law in Ontario, where a franchise must first be voted on by the ratepayers in their municipalities. None of the members coming from Ontario could take part in giving away a franchise without first having the vote of the people at municipal elections.

It is the people who own the property and give it away; that is the law in Canada. What law have we? What power have we in the House of Commons to hand over property which I say should belong to the people? After all is said and done, the country does not belong to the House of Commons. It is an inheritance of the past and a possession for the present. It is a trust for the future, and we have no right to hand it away. As President Roosevelt said, we have no right to hand out property to those who come along and ask for it or grab it—and then make a lot of wealth out of it in the way it is proposed to do in these pipe line bills.

We should be very careful before giving away our natural resources in any haphazard manner. Hon. members would not give their own property away in that manner. If they would not do that, then why as members of the House of Commons, with business capacity—and many hon. members, if not all of them, have such capacity—should they give away natural resources?

I remember on one occasion when the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) was standing in the company of the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) and myself in front of the Sir John A. Macdonald monument. Mr. Boucher, who used to represent the constituency of Carleton, was also there. The hon. member for Temiscouata asked if we saw anything wrong with the monument. I did not—because I am shortsighted, anyway. Then he said, "Look at his glasses; he has a pair of glasses in his right hand". I asked why and the member for Temiscouata said some people said Sir John was shortsighted and I said no, what Sir John was probably looking for was an honest man in the parliament buildings. I said that so far as I knew, they were all honest men in there. He said he was very much amused. After listening to the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) I began to think that he would have made his fortune as a comedian. There is a great element of truth in what was said by Sir Wilfrid Laurier that we have no right to give away the natural heritages of this country. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had an east