

Alberta Natural Gas Company

a charter to build pipe lines within and without Canada without restriction, we should not perpetuate that mistake by granting the same privilege to others.

The Alberta government has a measure of control over the export of gas, as also have the board of transport commissioners and the Department of Trade and Commerce. I am sure that Canadian interests will be well protected, and besides these controls which are vested in our governments and government corporations there is in my opinion an overwhelming public opinion which demands that our Canadian needs be met first.

During the last month it has been rather puzzling to me to understand why the Progressive Conservative party, who are the so-called proponents of private enterprise, have been party to a filibuster which would create a monopoly for one company, and also that the C.C.F., who are supposedly in favour of public enterprise, have given their support to a filibuster which, if successful, would create a monopoly for that private company.

I am supporting this bill because I do not believe parliament should be a party to creating a monopoly for one company.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on section 1 of this bill to incorporate Alberta Natural Gas Company. I might say before proceeding that this debate occurs on a date replete with historical significance. I think this day might be termed British Columbia's May day protest day. I do not offer any apology for continuing to protest concerning this and other bills, until they are amended so that, whichever company gets the charter, we will have an all-Canadian route to Vancouver, from one direction or the other.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra nearly thirty-six years ago stood side by side with me facing a common enemy who was determined, if he could, to impose his will upon us. Today we stand side by side facing opponents who are determined to impose their will upon us if they can, and to impose their will upon the great majority of the people in British Columbia. Thirty-six years ago, Mr. Chairman, we won our objective. I am of the opinion that today, or in the days to come, so far as this bill is concerned—or these other bills—history will repeat itself. In fact, I am firmly convinced of that because, in the first instance, we were standing for democratic principles, and in this instance we represent the majority of opinions and views of the people of British Columbia.

As a member of the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines—and I think in future it will possibly add pipe lines—I wish

to support the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra with respect to the manner of carrying on, shall I say, the business of that committee. During the lengthy debate that has occurred in recent months in connection with these pipe line bills we have been told repeatedly by members on the government side of the house that we should cease carrying on debate and should allow the bills to go to committee, and that in committee we could ask any questions we wished.

I recall that, from previous experience, I had always found when we got a bill into committee we were on the skids—and we jolly soon found we were on the skids when we got into that committee. I think the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, when he objected to the, shall I say, impropriety of the sponsor of the bill being a member of the committee, were quite correct. His opposition was correctly taken, and I support him in it. I am of opinion that no fair member of the committee who has time to look at the question in an objective way could say that the sponsor of the bill acted according to democratic principles in that committee.

I would say without doubt, and I think that privately at least some government members on the committee would support me, that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre dominated that committee, and as sponsor of the bill steered the action of the committee through the majority behind him. I take strong exception to that, and support the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra in that respect.

The committee had sat only a few hours when there was a mention of saving time. The first witness, Mr. Connolly, was asked to be allowed to stand down so that Mr. Dixon could be questioned, because it was thought that that would save time. We have the evidence of the technical expert—and I must give credit to Mr. Dixon as an excellent witness; I am not blaming the representatives of the natural gas company before the committee at all, for anything. They were courteous and answered the questions very well indeed.

It was suggested however that we ask Mr. Dixon the questions first so as to save duplication, and the assurance was given the committee that if members wished to ask Mr. Connolly the questions later, he would be recalled to the stand. In that instance the promise was not carried out. Mr. Dixon was questioned and, when the questioning was completed so far as Mr. Dixon was concerned, several members of the committee