

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

I know city people expect that they may be able to get gas at a lower rate than people in the adjacent rural areas. Only under a publicly-owned system can you do justice to the people in the smaller communities. If I may quote further from Mr. Bennett on the next page of *Hansard*:

I believe that there is no government in Canada that does not regret today that it has parted with some of these natural resources for considerations wholly inadequate and on terms that do not reflect the principle under which the crown holds the natural resources in trust for all the people.

The crown holds the natural resources in trust for all the people, not for a few people, not for powerful corporations that may make agreements with governments that pass away. They should be held in trust for the people of Canada, and we should not betray that trust. This is precisely the position we now take in regard to this great project. We are determined that as far as we can secure it, no government in Canada shall have need to regret in future years that it parted with those great resources on terms that do not reflect the principle under which the crown holds the resources in trust for all the people.

The Leader of the Opposition discussed the attitude of the house in 1951 when Bill No. 75, I think it was, was introduced by the hon. member for Vegreville. This was a bill to incorporate Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited and the mover, I believe in good faith, gave certain assurances to the house at that time. He said that it would follow an all-Canadian route. He outlined the cities that would be served both in the west and in Ontario. He assured the house that it was proposed to serve the communities along the Canadian National route from Coteau Junction to greater Montreal and ultimately along the north shore of the St. Lawrence as far as Quebec city. He went on to say that there was no need to discuss the federal act which assures control over the exportation of electricity and fluids. He said, if I may quote his own words:

It is my opinion that this act—

He was referring to the Electricity and Fluids Exportation Act.

—would have no application because all consumers will be in Canada and no gas will be exported out of Canada.

The effect which these assurances had on the house, which had been concerned about numerous proposals for pipe lines in or through the United States, was indicated very clearly by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, of the Progressive Conservative party, who is here tonight, when he said at page 736 of *Hansard* of February 27, 1951:

In view of the fact that the pipe line is to serve Canada first, and in fact in this case it will serve Canada only, I for one am very glad to support it.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

He had been opposing other pipe-line proposals. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, speaking on our behalf said, as reported at page 737 of the same issue of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, the assurance that has been given by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Decore) that the route followed by the pipe line to be built by the company covered by this bill will be an all-Canadian route makes it clear that there will not be an extended debate on this bill . . .

He added, however:

. . . there are some of us in this house who regret that the government is not going into the construction of pipe lines for the distribution of gas and oil on a public ownership basis. When I say "some of us" I am happy to include the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Gibson).

At that time he sat as an independent Liberal in this house.

While he does not belong to this socialist group, nevertheless he has taken the same position on former occasions.

Other hon. members of the house spoke along the same lines in support of the bill, because we understood it to be an all-Canadian pipe-line project entirely in Canada and under the control of Canadians. I bring this to the attention of the house, because at that time the principle of the bill was clearly believed to be that of an all-Canadian project with an assurance that the gas available would be utilized at all points across Canada including Montreal and the city of Quebec.

As the Leader of the Opposition noted this afternoon, when the bill was in committee Mr. Frank A. Schultz, vice president of the parent company, reiterated this assurance before the House of Commons committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. On March 6, 1951, at page 10 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of that committee, he said:

The second consideration was that it should be an all-Canadian project, that it would be Canadian gas transported over an all-Canadian line, and that 100 per cent of the consumption would be in Canadian cities.

We now have before us a proposition which is largely dependent on the verdict of the federal power commission of the United States of America, which is in effect a line to Emerson, with a spur line across northern Ontario to serve eastern Canada and having a smaller volume than the line which will go to the border of the United States.

When the bill came back to the house on March 9, 1951, there was a short debate because hon. members had heard witnesses testify with all confidence before the committee that the pipe line would be constructed as an all-Canadian project serving Canadian cities and with no export of gas to the United States, at least until Canada's own cities,