

Alberta Natural Gas Company

Mr. Blackmore: Stick to the facts.

Mr. Cruickshank: I am getting help from Lethbridge now. If the hon. member for Peace River did not issue any instructions I accept that, and I accept his apology.

Mr. Low: I must say there is no apology, Mr. Chairman. It was a statement of fact.

Mr. Cruickshank: If the information given to me as to where the instructions came from was wrong or incorrect I apologize to the hon. member for having associated his name with them, but I do not think I did.

The Chairman: Order. I think it would be much better to come back to the clause under consideration.

Mr. Low: Yes; let us get back to pipe lines.

Mr. Cruickshank: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I transgressed the rules. I very seldom break the rules of the house. I try to follow strictly in line at all times. If I have broken the rules I am sorry. I withdraw any of the suggestions that I made that the hon. members had orders. I do not think they did. They just fell in line.

To get back to the pipe lines, Mr. Chairman, what we from the province of British Columbia are particularly interested in is the development of small industries within our province.

I think I am in order in bringing this up, Mr. Chairman. You will notice that I did not come down to the chamber this afternoon with four or five hundred telegrams or five hundred letters which I have received, nor with a speech all typewritten out for me by someone in the Morgan Stanley Company. I am speaking without notes and without telegrams or letters, although I could produce them from every riding in the province of British Columbia, and from almost every board of trade in that province, favouring an all-Canadian route.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I respect the sincerity of my colleagues from British Columbia who believe in the United States route. I believe they are sincere in their belief that it should go through the United States, but we are asking the same appreciation of our sincerity. I now refer to those of us who believe in an all-Canadian route.

In my own particular district I realize that gas will never go into the individual homes and farms; that is obvious. But it could bring small industries to our towns, such industries as were mentioned in a letter to one of the most prominent businessmen and a constituent of mine. I will just mention two towns, the town of Kamloops and the town of Chilliwack. It is the cheapest form of power—

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

Mr. Fulton: One is the best and the other is the second best town in British Columbia.

Mr. Cruickshank: It is the cheapest form of power in the world. It could bring small industries, decentralized industries, to our towns.

The hon. member for Nanaimo mentioned the national defence point of view. I heard a little scoffing at that. But at the same time we hear our minister of external affairs, whose seat I am occupying at the present time while he is occupying one that I should like to occupy in Geneva or London, tell us how serious the international situation is. Is there any better way to prepare than to have power on our great Pacific coast? According to all the experts, we have only one possible enemy, and the most likely avenue of attack will be on the Pacific. Should we not have the power transferred to the province of British Columbia by the quickest, cheapest and the safest possible route?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce mentioned the consumer's angle a short time ago. It is quite true that the consumer should be protected and cared for; but the only figure that was given to the committee indicated that the additional cost of an all-Canadian route would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$17 million. That figure was picked out of the air by this great expert, Mr. Dixon. No reason was given for the \$17 million. He just picked the \$17 million out of the air. Not one iota of evidence was given to that committee, so far as I could hear, to show that the gas would cost one cent more if it went through an all-Canadian route, as opposed to an all-United States route.

We hear some amateur experts in this committee talk about slides and tunnelling. We were accused of supporting one company. So far as I know every hon. member from British Columbia who has spoken in opposition to the United States route has said that he did not care a hoot which company built it so long as it is an all-Canadian route. I know I am accused of being for the West-coast Transmission Company because I happened to sponsor their bill last year. We made a mistake last year in approving their charter without having written into it an all-Canadian route. We made that mistake, but two wrongs do not make a right. I went so far as to say—and I was speaking with authority—that the Westcoast Transmission Company was willing to have it written into its charter, provided it is written into the charters of the two other companies, that it should be an all-Canadian route. Can anything be fairer than that?

I am not a legal expert because I do not know anything about law. You know, Mr.