

*Prairie Transmission Lines*

until it reaches a point beyond Vancouver, the surplus gas will go on to Seattle, Tacoma, Portland and other points. The cost of the gas would be less in Vancouver and other Canadian points than in American points because they, at the end of the line, would have to pay a greater transportation cost. If the main line is built through the United States the opposite is the result. The cost of the gas would be greater in Vancouver and adjacent points in British Columbia than in American points to the south.

Allied to that is another fact. If the entire cost of transportation is added to the cost of the gas, so far as American consumers are concerned, in this way there is provided a certain amount of protection for Canadian manufacturers. They get their gas at a cheaper rate and therefore can manufacture more cheaply. The most outstanding example of that, one which I mentioned before, is the nitrogen or ammonia plant at Calgary, which is the greatest user of natural gas in that city, using as much as the entire city uses. At the present time it manufactures fertilizers which are sold in the United States. If a gas line could be built there, from the projected main source of supply, the Pincher Creek area, immediately across the border a similar plant could be constructed, just a short distance across the boundary line on the American side. They could manufacture ammonia as cheaply as we can at the plant in Calgary, and perhaps more cheaply. Naturally they would have no duty on their product.

For all these reasons it seems to me that this and the other pipe line bill should not be passed by parliament until we have had written into those bills the routes they are to follow. And if those routes so written in are not all-Canadian routes, then I believe the bills should be turned down.

I would reiterate what was said by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Smith) a few nights ago when he said that so far as he was concerned any bill which contains within it a route which is an all-Canadian route he is prepared to support. I am in exactly the same position. I am prepared to vote to give a charter to any company which shows that it is able to go ahead and construct a pipe line, and which is going to follow an all-Canadian route. They have surveyed it and have given some indication that it can be followed successfully.

**Mr. G. M. Murray (Cariboo):** Mr. Speaker, as a representative from the Peace river area of British Columbia I believe I have a right to make some comments at this time. Within the boundaries of that riding are many gas wells, and fair prospects for the development

[Mr. Harkness.]

of oil wells. Be it said for one of these companies that it has shown enough confidence in the country to go in there and set up drilling outfits, and to establish great resources of natural gas.

The interest, therefore, of our people is, first, that these resources be used right in the vicinity, in the towns of that neighbourhood—Dawson Creek, Fort St. John and Prince George, all of which are flourishing centres. We live in the north where the winters are long and the weather is cold. We need cheap fuel. Nature has been generous in giving the Peace river country these resources of oil, natural gas and coal.

It seems to me the House of Commons is wasting a great deal of time in the discussion of these bills. I am reminded of the hunter who sold the hide of the bear while the animal was still at large in the woods. Our time here should be spent not in incorporating this or that company for the purpose of establishing pipe lines, but rather to encourage the drilling for oil and gas up in that northern part of British Columbia, so as to create new payrolls, new industries and new resources for the Canadian people.

I hate to say that people would seek a monopoly in Canada, because we know monopolies are not good for a country. We have seen what has happened in connection with our railways. It is only fair that there should be an open field for those capitalists who have the courage to go into these enterprises. I am going to say that, so far as voting in connection with the measure before the house is concerned, I will vote for what will serve my own community first, the province of British Columbia second, and the Dominion of Canada third.

I would hate to be classified as one who has encouraged filibustering. I know the people in Calgary who put their money into the Westcoast Transmission Company Limited. They are splendid fellows with a great deal of courage. They have gone ahead and developed these oil wells. I am sure there are good men back of these other companies; and we need development of that kind, having in mind the best interests of the Canadian people.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, when the debate on these pipe line bills started some time ago many of us did not know much about them, but so much has been said in the meantime that we have become familiar with them. In addition to what we have heard inside the house, people outside the house have talked