

Alberta Natural Gas Company

Now I should like to quote a few sentences from the oldest publication in British Columbia. This article appeared in the *Columbian* of New Westminster only last week:

Large scale discussion of the great Alberta reserves of natural gas and the chances of exporting some of that valuable fuel to consumers in British Columbia has come out of the pipe line hearings in Calgary recently. And with the discussion some new facts have come to light.

To those close to the subject it might not be new, but to the B.C. citizen who just wants to see Alberta gas piped in to this province, it is interesting to note one fact on which everyone apparently agrees. Piping natural gas from Alberta to the coast is not going to be economically possible for anyone unless they also pipe some of the gas into the more populous area south of the border, the state of Washington. It may wound our provincial pride a bit, but we'd do better to accept this fact for what it is, the key to our own chances for getting Alberta gas.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the various reasons I have already enumerated, in order that this debate may be brought to an early conclusion I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Goode):

That this question be now put.

Mr. O. L. Jones (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I did not enter into a discussion of this particular bill, on behalf of the people I represent in British Columbia. The last speaker put the controversy in a nutshell, when he said that no one knows where this pipe line is going to go. The trouble is that no one knows, and no one seems to care, providing the bill passes. We in British Columbia want to know, and we do care. It is for that reason I am speaking tonight.

Our objection to this pipe line going directly to the United States is the same as that expressed at the last session. On that occasion, we expressed the opinion that the pipe line would go directly to Spokane, and thence across country to Seattle and Tacoma. That has not been denied, nor has a good case been put up by the other side refuting our claim that this would be to the detriment of the province of British Columbia. The absence of that denial indicates to me that our claims are correct. In speaking against this bill, I want to make it quite clear that I cast no reflection on the company or the personnel forming the company. I have heard of most of them, but I do not know them. So far as I know, they are just the usual company whose motive is profit, and in order to get the most profit they want to get to the biggest market in the cheapest possible way, disregarding the people of British Columbia as well as the people of Alberta, who have a great stake in what is to be done with this natural resource.

[Mr. MacDougall.]

Not only does this application before us tonight ignore all the suggestions we have made, but I believe it ignores the expressed views of this house. I know that one group has been quite silent, but possibly some of them agree with our point of view. I can assure you that until the clause for which we have asked is inserted in the bill, to the effect that the pipe line will follow a Canadian route, we will continue to raise our objections.

Public opinion in British Columbia is really aroused about this issue. I think I can do no better than to read to you an editorial which appeared in the *Vancouver Sun* on the third of this month. The *Vancouver Sun* has the largest circulation of any paper in our province. I believe it is Liberal in its politics, and would naturally try to indicate to the British Columbia Liberal members the course that they should follow. The editorial reads as follows:

Ordinarily we'd be ashamed of the spectacle of a filibuster in which MP's waste the time that Canada's parliament might usefully devote to other issues.

But in the case of the filibuster now under way at Ottawa, under leadership of George Cruickshank of Fraser Valley and A. L. Smith of Calgary West, we are merely ashamed of the necessity for it.

These members believe that desperate situations require desperate remedies. They are struggling, in the only way open to them, to hold the line against American interests which seek to siphon off the petroleum resources of Alberta to the detriment of British Columbia.

So Mr. Cruickshank and his associates are trying to block the incorporation bills of these American companies.

The issue is whether surplus gas from Alberta shall be piped to Pacific coast markets through British Columbia or directly south into the United States. One company already incorporated has undertaken to route its pipe line through the interior of British Columbia. The other applicants will give no such undertaking. There is every reason to suspect that they have no such intention. Apparently the majority of MP's—other than Mr. Cruickshank and his group—don't care.

The matter is vital to the development of British Columbia. The outcome will strongly influence our economic future. With so much at stake, we wish to convey sincere thanks to the filibusterers and to wish them all the strength and volubility that may be necessary to thwart a major economic injustice.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the view of the *Vancouver Sun*, and it expresses quite well the view of the people of British Columbia regarding this particular bill. In common with the editorial writer, I believe we should not waste the time of the house in discussing this bill. Unfortunately, there is no other way in which we can stop such a bill passing than by talking it out. We are quite willing to discuss it, or to have the other side come forward and give logical reasons why they are unable to take the pipe line through British Columbia. So far, I have not heard any reason. I have before me a report, but