

*Alberta Natural Gas Company*

the confidence of the government instead of having the board of transport commissioners taken into that confidence?

Many people have asked: Why do we do this? Everybody overlooks one thing. Are we just supposed to sit here and put the stamp of approval on it? The government said—and this is so true—the real reason why we passed the Pipe Lines Act making it necessary for people trying to carry gas to be incorporated by the House of Commons is this. They have the right to expropriate property. Are we men in this house going to issue to anybody a right carrying with it the power of expropriation without having some idea where that expropriation is going to be done? Remember, sir, that by incorporating a company with these powers we cast aside, we tear to pieces, the right of any individual where these people wish to cross his property with their pipe line. That is the reason we brought this to the House of Commons. That is the reason why we are not rubber stamps. The reason is that we are giving to any company a most extraordinary power, the right to go up on your land and take it away from you. It is true that things will be settled by boards of arbitration and so on; but the minute we pass these bills here we give the right to these people to expropriate. It is true they have to get over their hurdles, but we give them the basic right of expropriation of property. That is the real reason and we knew it when the pipe lines bill was passed. That is the real reason we required them to come to the House of Commons.

I will say no more than this. Is it reasonable to suppose that we are sitting here unconcerned? Let us credit all of us with the idea that we are seeking to do the best we can for our country. Let us permit the difficulties that we have had with one another to resolve themselves into the great fact that we are here to do good for Canada. That being so I stand firmly behind the amendment which I have seconded, and simply say to this company, build your pipe line where you will, but you will build it in Canada. That is the issue. There is no issue other than that before us at the present time.

Mr. Dixon said that he had five routes, and if the suggestion of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Prudham) is correct, he is now going to explore a sixth. Let him do so; that is fine; he has lots of time. But let us say to him and to everybody else, including the company which got the charter last fall: Go ahead and compete with one another. Go before the two boards, the one in Alberta and the one here. Prove to these boards that you are able to do it. Prove to these boards that you have the money to

[Mr. Smith (Calgary West).]

do it. I think I have read a list of names which will convince you about one company. But prove to them in competition that your claim is better than the other fellow's. I will go with that one hundred per cent. I said that when I began. I have said nothing to the contrary. I say it now. But I do say, having been born in that western country, the only place and the only life that I know well, that I have watched it struggle from the days when my grandparents hauled wheat by horse 14 miles into Regina and sold it for 50 cents a bushel, and incidentally retired in some comfort on that basis. I have watched it grow, and here today what are we doing? We are passing a bill. I do not say that the board of transport commissioners will not stop this, and I will not say that they will not stop that; but I do say that unless this line goes by a Canadian route you can kiss the Peace river and the interior of British Columbia good-bye, so far as your life and mine are concerned, sir. So I simply put it on this basis. Even I may be wrong in the things I have said today. I think the minister was wrong. I do not think we should drag—what is the expression?—red herrings across the trail.

**Mr. MacDougall:** Dead cats.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary West):** Did the hon. member say, "nightcaps?" I don't drag those, I swallow them. I do not think we should be disturbed by little complexities, by devious stories and devious arguments that are introduced. To my mind it amounts to this. Are we now in favour of a Canadian route? Do not let us worry about engineering niceties. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Goode) got a figure from Mr. Dixon which indicated that it was going to cost the people of Vancouver \$700,000 more for their gas. Mr. Dixon talked a good, shall I say, pussy. I think he would be good at playing darts or something of that kind. There is no evidence before the house that anything like that will follow. On the other hand, if you want to go to the sworn testimony given in the city of Calgary in the province of Alberta lasting over a matter of a month, given before three experts, the deputy minister of mines, Mr. McKinnon, Professor Gauvreau and an engineer by the name of Goodall, you will find that this other company put all their cards on the table. They were cross-examined by Mr. Dixon's lawyer, a great friend of mine, Mr. H. G. Nolan, K.C., who conducted prosecutions in Tokyo on behalf of this government. These men are not without assistance. They are not without help. In this committee no one was allowed to call evidence. But I pass that over. That was just a bit of steam