

Boundary Pipeline Corporation

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. Abbott: Now.

Mr. Knowles: By leave.

Mr. Speaker: I have already expressed my opinion on the right of the hon. member to say "by leave".

Mr. Knowles: It is correct to say that Your Honour expressed an opinion on it. But you did not rule on the point, did you, sir?

Mr. Speaker: I have expressed my opinion; that is all that I said.

Mr. Knowles: I will reserve my speech until you do reach the point of making a ruling.

Mr. Abbott moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

BOUNDARY PIPELINE CORPORATION

The house resumed, from Friday, June 13, consideration in committee of Bill No. 62, to incorporate Boundary Pipeline Corporation—Mr. Larson—Mr. Beaudoin in the chair.

On section 1—*Incorporation*.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I want to say in continuing the discussion of section 1 of this bill is by way of congratulation to the sponsor. According to page 18 of today's order paper it would appear that the sponsor of this bill is in perhaps a unique position in the history of private bills in this house. Not only is his bill the first on the order paper; it is the only item appearing there. I have tried for many years to have bills or resolutions in which I was interested come to the top of the list, and I think on only one occasion a resolution of mine came up for discussion; and although it may have been at the top of the list, it was not the only one on the list. I think the hon. member for Kindersley deserves our hearty congratulations upon having arrived in this unique position.

When I spoke on Friday night on this clause I was discussing some of the reasons some of us are opposed to this bill and feel that the group of gentlemen seeking incorporation for the purpose of transporting gas from Alberta to Winnipeg and thence south

[Mr. Laing.]

into the United States should not be granted a charter. The main reason I think a charter should not be granted is that if a charter is granted and the company incorporated and gas exported in the manner indicated, it is a certainty that Alberta natural gas will never reach Ontario and Quebec.

I think there are other reasons which should occur to all hon. members of this committee why this charter should not be granted at the present time. These reasons emerge from the latest decision of the board of transport commissioners with respect to an application by another company, West-coast Transmission Limited. Your Honour is probably as familiar as I or any other member with the reasons for the decision given by the board in that case. It will be remembered that the board said that although they favoured the application of Westcoast Transmission Limited over the application of any other company seeking to export Alberta gas to British Columbia and the Pacific northwest, nevertheless they felt that before they could give approval to the application—in case you are uneasy, Mr. Chairman, that this is sub judice, may I say that the board has handed down its decision—they felt it was necessary to conduct an independent inquiry into the question of the gas reserves available in Alberta.

The Chairman: If I am uneasy about anything it is about the fact that the last time the hon. member spoke for 38 minutes, and he has spoken tonight for more than 2 minutes.

Mr. Fulton: Your Honour is keeping better track of my time than I am, and I shall conclude my remarks immediately by saying that if the board of transport commissioners felt that before they could give final approval to an application to export gas they should reserve their decision because there was a question as to whether there were sufficient gas reserves to export to the Pacific northwest, then there must surely be the same question with respect to an application to export gas to the east.

Another main reason hon. members, particularly those from western Canada, should be opposed to this application is the fact that the *Financial Post* of June 14, published in Toronto—I know this will interest the hon. member for Fraser Valley—contains an editorial condemning the efforts of those who are opposed to this application. We in western Canada have always said that if the *Financial Post* was opposed to anything, that was a good thing to favour. If the *Financial Post* is opposed to the efforts of those of us who seek to prevent this company getting a charter I am reinforced, if I needed any