

to talk us into some sense of sane reasonableness instead of childish bickering over procedure. At this time we have a job to do in this country, and I am saying it should be done and it must be done now, not 40 years from now after the atomic age has come into effect, at a time when Alberta sits, as it does, on one-seventh of the world's coal and still has a 50-year supply of gas in the ground.

I say the opposition are holding up this bill for political purposes. From time to time they have read political extracts from great newspapers across this country. I find that a newspaper editorial is the opinion of one man only, and I am going to read the opinion of another editor. It is true he comes from the province of Alberta; he publishes his newspaper there. Fortunately—I almost said “unfortunately”—both in British Columbia and in Alberta we have been blessed with not having the newspapermen support the Social Credit party, so no one can accuse me of reading a Social Credit version of this thing. This comes from the *Camrose Canadian*, and is dated May 23, 1956. It deals specifically with this problem. The editor of a small paper said this. He is just a small home-town man and knows the views of every householder in his area. The editorial reads in part:

We do not profess to know the whole story, but we do know that if Alberta gas is to be transported to Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec without the tragic delay of some three or four years, the federal government must come to the rescue. While nominally conservative in our political thinking, we cannot subscribe to opposition leader Drew's opposition to the legislation.

Mr. Ellis: You took time to find it.

Mr. Hahn: No, I did not. It was sent to me. The hon. member quoted the *Regina Leader-Post* the other night, and read an editorial about Saskatchewan socialism and its gas policy and compared the price of 90 cents paid in Rosetown-Biggart for natural gas. Ask the people of Maple Creek about their natural gas situation.

You, the hon. member for Regina City, do not have to tell me anything about Saskatchewan. I lived there for a few years, and I know the gas situation there as well as in Alberta, and that is a great deal more than I can say for you because you are going to enjoy it for the first time while I enjoyed it for many years past.

I read again:

While nominally conservative in our political thinking, we cannot subscribe to opposition leader Drew's opposition to the legislation. We think it is well for the opposition to stand out for all the facts and figures to be laid upon the table for all parties to investigate,—

That is the reason we are in committee. I think that is the reason the Prime Minister

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

today suggested we should have four days left as a committee to discuss this bill, but that has been turned down.

An hon. Member: There is no chance to discuss the first three clauses.

Mr. Hahn: No, not so long as we continue in this ridiculous fashion and will not permit the whips of the parties to meet and come to some determinate action so we can get in and ask questions about this thing, instead of continuing in this foolish fashion.

Mr. Ellis: You voted to postpone the clauses.

Mr. Hahn: Not at all. I continue:

—but to obstruct the progress of the legislation for apparently political reasons alone, we cannot endorse at all. If it were practical at the moment, we think the C.C.F. approach is preferable to that of the Conservatives.

Here is a Conservative who feels that the C.C.F. approach would be more practical than is the present approach of the Conservatives. I can understand the editor's feeling in that respect, as I am sure any truly honest Conservative in this house today can. What is their policy? They endorse the McMahon proposal which will take 400 million cubic feet of gas into the United States instead of 200 million.

I am told that the hon. member for Broadway—or rather Broadview, although possibly he comes from Broadway—says that his party endorses the McMahon proposal. The hon. member for Prince Albert early in the debate said they wanted this gas for Canadians but their endorsement is to send 400 million cubic feet of gas to the United States and to retain 100 million cubic feet for Canadians. That was the McMahon proposal, as I understood it.

Continuing with this editorial:

The main thing to be considered is to get a Canadian fuel to the doors of millions of Canadian consumers. Alberta has the natural gas in sufficient quantities to last for fifty to sixty years, even if no further fields were tapped than are now known. By that time scientists will have solved the problem of converting Alberta's abundance of coal into gases that can be transported by pipe line.

Mr. MacDougall: Attaboy.

Mr. Hahn: It has been suggested from time to time, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of getting the pipe line built is not important and that we can wait for two or three years. Why not wait for 40 years? We did with the shipment of Albert coal out here, with the result that they still have it in that province.

Mr. Ellis: You waited five years for Trans-Canada Pipe Lines.

Mr. Murphy (Westmorland): Down, Wimpy.

Mr. MacDougall: Quiet, Wimpy.