

Alberta Natural Gas Company

who had waited two days for an opportunity to question Mr. Connolly on legal matters were denied their opportunity.

On Thursday the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, moved what was in effect a motion of closure, to shorten the questioning of the witnesses. That closure motion was carried, because of the majority on the committee behind the sponsor of the bill. As a result of that motion carrying, several members on the committee did not have the opportunity to ask either Mr. Dixon or Mr. Connolly important questions they had wished to ask.

I put it to the committee this way: these bills represent an investment in Canadian natural resources to the extent of between \$75 million and \$100 million, before the projects are completed. This committee of the House of Commons, dealing with a subject that may affect the whole course of the development of British Columbia for generations to come, because of the government majority thereon, was permitted to spend not more than twelve hours discussing the bill and asking questions on an important matter representing an investment of from \$75 million to \$100 million in Canadian natural resources. I ask the house to look at this matter in all fairness, and particularly members from eastern Canada who may be under the impression that we are carrying on a filibuster out of pure cussedness, shall I say. We are trying to present the point of view of the people of British Columbia. The members of the committee who are presenting that point of view are firmly of the opinion that we did not have an opportunity to perform our duties properly in the committee because of the government majority supporting the tactics of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, the sponsor of the bill.

I oppose the bill on several grounds. I am not going to go into all of them tonight. I oppose it first of all, and I have no hesitation in doing so, on the basis of the principle that I believe the use of Canadian natural resources should be first assured to the Canadian people. I think that is a reasonable proposition and one that members of all parties should support. From the evidence given to the committee I am quite convinced that the use of these Canadian natural resources has not been assured to Canadian people first. For instance, when Mr. Dixon, the very capable engineer representing this company, was questioned as to the amount allocated to the large city of Vancouver, he replied in effect that the amount being allocated was less than the present domestic use of gas in the city of Calgary. No one can say that is an adequate provision for Canadian

[Mr. Herridge.]

requirements in the city of Vancouver, and without any possibility of expansion in the future. The gentleman in question said that the pipe line program was being designed to operate in the first five years at about 75 per cent capacity. Therefore on that basis if the people of Vancouver are going to have less gas than the city of Calgary is using at the present time for domestic purposes, and are then going to get some proportion of the remaining 25 per cent that it is expected will be developed, you can see that the final provision for the city of Vancouver is not more than the present use in the city of Calgary.

Mr. Blackmore: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Herridge: Certainly.

Mr. Blackmore: What reason did Mr. Dixon give for the estimate that Vancouver would only receive so small an amount of gas? There is enough gas, is there not? What is he intending to do with all the gas available if Vancouver is not to obtain its share?

Mr. Herridge: I cannot remember the exact reason given at the time.

Mr. Harkness: No reason was given.

Mr. Herridge: I do not remember the reason. I was going to say that quite an unusual procedure was followed in connection with these measures. Members of the committee had their first meeting on Tuesday, the 25th of April last, and this is Monday, May 1. To date we have only had the printed evidence of the first meeting of the committee and that has to do with the C.P.R. bill. We have not had an opportunity to study the evidence as to the measure now before us and to be quite certain of the answers to questions. I think we should have had that evidence on this most important matter if we want to be fair. I do not want to be unfair to Mr. Dixon, Mr. Connolly, or any member of the committee. Therefore I am not able to say exactly what answer was given, because I do not remember it. Generally speaking, however, I remember that Canada was to receive about 25 per cent of the total gas to be carried through the pipe line.

Mr. Green: Twenty per cent.

Mr. Herridge: Twenty per cent of the total amount of gas going through the pipe line, and 80 per cent was to go to the United States. Only yesterday I was reading of the measures that are being taken in the United States to conserve natural gas because they believe that in from 25 to 30 years the supply of natural gas in a number of areas in that country will be exhausted. We must realize