

Alberta Natural Gas Company

look south and see the escarpment of Point Roberts, which is in the United States of America.

Our city is about fifteen miles north of the United States boundary, and in it we have a great concentration of people. That, in part, lends itself to the difficulties we have in matters of employment at certain seasons of the year. We in British Columbia want to decentralize our industry. We have to build up a great country north of Prince George. We have got to develop the Kootenays and develop further the Okanagan district. We are too much in one place, in British Columbia, for our own good.

Reference has been made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano to the development which has taken place in the northwestern states of the United States. This started with the policy of that great president, President Roosevelt, who thought it wise to put more people in the northwestern states. Great development has taken place there. I believe the development of those states—and I am referring particularly to Washington, Oregon, Idaho and the western tier of Montana—has been subsidized by the federal government of the United States to the extent of at least 25 per cent in the last twenty years. They have great curving highways. These are military highways, because they were built by engineers of the United States government. They have Grand Coulee—indeed, they have, as a matter of fact, 27 per cent of all the developed power in the United States and 41 per cent of the potential.

Little wonder that our people in British Columbia look somewhat askance at any plan which might send natural gas or other fuels down to those states to build them up. We know something about the economic pull. The people of British Columbia today want the 49th parallel to remain the division between our two great countries. If we get too great development there we know what it will mean economically. As a matter of fact, in our part of the country there is today an organization known as the northwest trade and development association. I believe that is the name of it. It has members on both sides of the line, in the United States of America and in Canada. What can come out of that, I do not know; but it indicates some of the primary and basic thinking that might lead to a change of that line.

I do not want to see it changed. I do not think it needs to be changed if we take some care, as two or three other members have said, in seeing to it that we get the first use of the primary products which enter into the

cost of manufacturing and industrial processes in Canada. Unlike some members, I believe we have to have faith in our board of transport commissioners. In addition, I have a great deal of faith in the petroleum and oil conservation board of Alberta. As it stands, I intend to vote for these bills, but inside and outside the house I am going to do my very best to build up an opinion in our province that will demand that, before any gas is exported to the United States, the line proceed through British Columbia and end in Vancouver so far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I am not from British Columbia, but I am exceedingly happy at the turn the debate has taken tonight. In the five years I have been in the house I have never seen such an extraordinary change, as it were, in the opinions of certain members of the house. As I say, I am very happy at the turn it has taken. I should like to congratulate particularly the hon. member for Coast-Capilano in whom for the first time tonight I thought I recognized some semblance to the same old member for Vancouver North whom we used to admire so much in this house for his independent and crusading spirit. I had to take him to task the other day, and I think he deserved it, for continually interrupting speeches in the house, and at that moment mine particularly. May I say I shall be delighted to take back that chastisement, verbal only of course, in view of his change of mind? I have no doubt in my own mind that this general change of heart has been the work of the same hon. member for Coast-Capilano.

There is one thing that has occurred to me in this surprising debate. I have a little difficulty at times, and I think some other members of the house also have, in understanding exactly what the hon. member for Kootenay East means when he speaks. I admit I had some difficulty tonight in completely understanding his position, or even his words. He talked much of what he pronounces as pipe line "routs". May I suggest that this recantation on the part of these fine young British Columbia members perhaps spells the rout of pipe lines at least in regard to the route through the United States. The hon. member for Kootenay East also accused certain people in the house and on the committee, people whom he did not name, of holding up this particular legislation by what has been called a filibuster. I took no part in that in the committee and little in the house, but I want to say to the hon. member for Kootenay East and to other members who have spoken, and who in my opinion have