

Natural Resources—Development

similar figure. There may be some explanation for these figures. There may be something that would explain why, after all of these assurances that natural gas would be sold to Canadians at more favourable prices, Canadians have to pay 30 cents while the Northwest Pacific Pipeline Corporation will be receiving gas at 22½ and 22 cents. It was for that reason that I, perhaps in my ignorance, supported the chartering of a company which would have enabled the company to apply to the various agencies to obtain permission to build the pipe line. Two or three times during a session the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra attempts to mislead the public, as he has done in the past, regarding this pipeline question.

Now, there is no comparison between the Trans-Canada Pipe Line and the Westcoast Transmission Line or any pipe line which would be providing gas for the lower mainland of British Columbia and the northwest Pacific. The bulk of the gas coming to the east will be used in eastern Canada, and of course we have this huge consumer, the International Nickel Company, in northern Ontario. I do not want the hon. member to think, therefore, that there is any connection, in so far as policy is concerned, between these two lines. The Westcoast Transmission Company, or any other line which may be serving British Columbia and the northwest Pacific, is doing so on the basis of at least 85 to 90 per cent of the gas going to United States markets. When I say that, I want to hasten to assure the house and the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra that I do not subscribe to this hate America campaign that has been carried on recently both in the house and in the newspapers by some hon. members. All I want is to have these things done economically and in the best interests of Canadians generally. I am sure when they are done on the most economical basis, then that is for the greatest good of all Canadians.

But let us get back to Inland Natural Gas, which will now join the main line somewhere along the Fraser river. I do not know just exactly where they intend to make their connection, but before their line ever reaches the largest potential consumer they will have travelled 400 or 500 miles, so this great consumer in West Kootenay will be at the end of a pipe line anywhere from 1,100 to 1,400 miles long. A line directly across British Columbia through Crowsnest pass would provide them with gas at a distance of perhaps 250 miles or 300 miles from the wellhead.

While the Alberta Natural Gas Company did not have any firm contracts, they had discussions with the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company and were prepared to

supply them, as I said earlier, on the basis of their being a distributor, and the gas would have been economically competitive in their metallurgical plant. I had occasion to discuss this and other matters not so long ago with the western general manager. I questioned him directly as to whether or not they intended to make use of the natural gas which would be coming to them through Westcoast Transmission and Inland Natural Gas. The answer was that the price was too far out of line; that it was not competitive with their present fuel. Therefore this great plant, under present circumstances, will not be able to use the natural gas. Where do we go from there?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Applewhaite): Order. I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. Hansell: May I ask the hon. gentleman just one question. I listened rather attentively and I am not yet able to determine whether he is in favour of the amendment or against it? Would he mind stating his position?

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, it is with very great regret that I find I am unable to conclude my remarks. As I said, the field was so large that I just could not remain within the time limit. I wish to assure the hon. member that, like the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, I feel the provinces are doing an excellent job and that we should in no way interfere with their development of their natural resources unless they make representations to the federal government. For that reason I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. F. S. Zaplitny (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the question before the house is a proposal by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of his party calling on this parliament to adopt a national development policy. It is a very wide subject and one in which every Canadian must find interest because, if such a step were taken, it would affect every part of this country.

So far the discussion has—and I hope the Leader of the Opposition will pardon me for using this term; it is not meant to show any disrespect to him—has sounded very materialistic. That is to say, in my opinion it has not been related to the needs of the Canadian people. We have talked so far in terms of development as if we were talking of development for the sake of development, as if we were to develop our resources in a sort of vacuum without it being related to the everyday lives of the Canadian people. It is from that point of view particularly that I wish to say a few words today.