

*Alberta Natural Gas Company*

the board which parliament had selected only a year ago to discharge that responsibility was competent to do so. There is the law, and the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the government must decide where the pipe line is going to be built before the board of transport commissioners can deal with the matter.

It is not a case of having confidence in that board. Even at this late hour all the bitterness of debate, all the suggestions that one motive or another was guiding any argument, could be completely removed by the government by the simple and effective device of introducing an amendment to the act which would state as a principle applying to every company the proposition that we are going to assure to our own people the use of these resources which Providence has given us before they can be exported to a neighbour which, friendly though it may be, would be the very last to expect us to do something that they themselves have never done when their own primary interests were concerned.

The suggestion has been made that this would create a monopoly. The suggestion has been made that if members vote against these bills there will be a monopoly in favour of the company which has already received a charter. The Minister of Trade and Commerce knows that the Westcoast Transmission Company or any other company cannot get authority to proceed until the government has approved. He knows, as every other minister knows, that they can remove any question of that kind by adopting the simple proposal that I have been making, the one contemplated by the Prime Minister in the statement he made as recently as May 5. There is, however, danger of a very great monopoly. There is danger of a monopoly which would not serve Canadian interests. We want United States funds to be invested here for the development of Canada. We want risk capital to come into this country to advance the legitimate development of Canada in every way. This country, however, now possesses the initiative and the capital to assume the responsibility for some of these developments ourselves. Even now, forgetting what was said this afternoon, I urge the government to do what they can to meet the situation, and I urge those hon. members who have been so ready to applaud statements which were inaccurate to look at the simple law and to understand it.

As I said, we have seen democracy working in the house. We have seen democracy working in another way. Members of the house on the other side have been very comfortably

brushing aside all arguments with the statement, "You saw what the people did on June 27." The government has a substantial majority, but the people are afforded opportunities from time to time to express their opinions and they expressed them today in no uncertain way. In both by-elections today Progressive Conservative candidates were elected with satisfactory majorities. It is certainly a matter of real satisfaction to see a young veteran of the last war succeeding the late Tommy Church, and with a majority increased to close to 5,000. It is also most satisfactory for a number of reasons to see that the majority against our candidate of over 3,000 was overcome in the other election in Hamilton, and that the house is to have a lady member because of the results today. These very substantial gains, approximately 4,000 in one case and 3,500 in the other, are evidence of the fact that the people of this country are not satisfied with the cavalier attitude adopted by the government to their interests since June 27 last. I hope, just as we have seen certain members here whose views on this subject were greatly influenced by what they heard when they went back to their constituencies over the Easter holidays, that others will realize this is the voice of democracy speaking, and that they have been given reasons to examine what has taken place.

The remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) which I shall not repeat, and his assertion today that he proposes to retain the privilege of advising anyone to take a trip in the particular direction which he did a few days ago, do not meet the desires of the people, and should not meet the sense of responsibility of members of this house. We have before the house an amendment and an amendment to the amendment. The amendment to the amendment raises a point which every hon. member should take into consideration. Speaking for myself I propose to support the amendment to the amendment. It touches on a point which has already been mentioned but which it will be well to have dealt with by a vote. That is the fact that obviously, contrary to the opinion of many hon. members, the Pipe Lines Act does not give the board of transport commissioners any authority whatever to control tolls so far as gas pipe lines are concerned. Once the charter is granted and the licence approved a pipe line which is not competitive with any other line is not subject to an order of the board of transport commissioners in regard to tolls, as is the case with an oil pipe line. I think every hon. member, and particularly those on the government side, should ask why there is that omission, why it is that gas pipe line companies are going to be able to charge