

International Rivers

could very well hold up indefinitely the Frobisher development on the Taku river in northern British Columbia. That possibility should be thoroughly investigated before this bill is allowed to proceed past second reading. That is a proposition which we are prepared to debate. Another reason we are fighting this bill is that it is just one more indication of the utter inconsistency of the government, especially with respect to energy and the export of energy. I want to point out some inconsistencies in connection with their policy in that regard, if one can call it a policy. Let us take oil, for example. Canada is not yet self-sufficient in oil. We have been trying our level best to become self-sufficient, but there have been times when we have had to draw heavily on the United States, and even though they were not self-sufficient and had to draw it from the east they were good enough to let us have their oil.

We are exporting oil today, and there has been no problem in connection with that. That oil is being exported into the midwestern United States by way of Gretna, Manitoba. I would point out that that is a wasting asset, but what we are talking about now is a renewable asset and comes into a different category altogether. Let me illustrate the point with respect to gas. At the present time gas is being exported under licence from a very isolated section of southern Alberta where there is no concentration of industry. That is being exported to the Anaconda Copper company at Anaconda, Montana, and no one is raising a hurrah about that. Why did the Liberals not come in and raise the dickens because Alberta was making a deal with the Anaconda company?

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): That deal was proposed by the federal government and recommended to Alberta, which province approved and implemented the proposal; and the gas is now being exported under federal licence.

Mr. Low: May I point out that in taking the stand they did they were showing their inconsistency. Furthermore, the province of Alberta gave them every co-operation in what they were doing. What else could we do? We did not have to give them the gas. We had control of that supply within the province, and no Liberal government could have objected to that. Not only that, but at the present time plans are being made for the export of natural gas from Alberta down into eastern Canada and concurrently into the midwestern United States. Where is the consistency in this policy?

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Who asked us to arrange that?

Mr. Low: Yes, we asked you, but we asked for something more than that. We asked for a policy that would make it possible for us to export that gas and guarantee to the producers in our province a decent well-head price. I am not at all convinced as to the sagacity of the minister or the government in the way they arranged that whole deal.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): You are very capable of shifting your ground.

Mr. Low: We are not shifting ground. I have already pointed out the utter inconsistency of the whole policy. Let us now deal for a moment with electricity. I have pointed out that already some electricity is being exported into a northwest power pool from British Columbia.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): On a temporary basis.

Mr. Low: It does not make any difference whether it is temporary or not. The important thing is that it is being exported, and if there is danger of building up a vested interest on the other side there is just as much danger in this present export instance as there would be in regard to the proposal we are now discussing.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Rave on.

Mr. Low: Let us use a little logic and reasoning instead of a lot of hooey. The minister's own atomic energy committee is manufacturing plutonium and other derivatives of uranium at Chalk River and exporting them to the United States. I believe a good case could be made out to show that these fissionable derivatives of uranium could be far more important to Canada in future years than the comparatively small amount of water power involved in the Kaiser proposition could ever be. Yet we do not hear the Liberals working up much hysteria about that.

Bill No. 3 should be withdrawn and put into cold storage until this government has the good sense to sit down with the provinces and work out a satisfactory and comprehensive natural energy policy which will be in the best interests of the whole of the country. When they do that it may be that legislation such as Bill No. 3 might be needed as part of an over-all policy. If so, then I imagine sensible people everywhere will realize it and give their co-operation in trying to get such legislation. But let us have it introduced in a sensible manner, as part of a comprehensive natural energy and fuel policy.

It is awkward at any time to try to debate the merits of a bill by tying it to a single