

spoke in this house this afternoon. He will find out what it means to kill or be killed. He killed himself in Alberta and when the next election rolls around he will find out exactly what I mean. The people of Alberta are going to question the position he has taken.

**Mr. Bell:** What about you in Quebec?

**An hon. Member:** Leave Quebec alone.

**Mr. Low:** Let me say that as I listened to the Leader of the Opposition last evening I could not help feeling that the hon. gentleman, much as I respect and admire him personally, was proceeding in his address on the assumption that if he made exaggerated and unfounded statements often enough and loud enough they would eventually become true. I should like it to be known that I like the hon. gentleman and I want him to know that. All throughout his speech he continued repeating time after time statements he could not back up, statements that are completely unfounded and which I think he should be called upon to prove or to keep quiet about.

Now, as far as the C.C.F. is concerned, let me say this. As I said, I think they have honestly put forward their view with respect to nationalization of the pipe line but let me hasten to add I do not think they have a moral right to base a filibuster upon the principle of nationalization and I will tell you why. The C.C.F. have been putting forward this argument and this principle for the last 20-odd years in Canada and in every election campaign nationalization has been one of their major platforms. Election after election the people of Canada have turned down the principle and the proposition overwhelmingly. Under the circumstances I do not attempt to deny them the right to put forward the principle of nationalization of the pipe line here but I do say that morally they do not have the right to base a filibuster on it in an attempt to kill this bill.

One thing which interests me about the C.C.F. argument is the fact that they have closed their eyes to a lot of realities. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who just finished speaking closed his eyes to realities when he said the government could go ahead this year and build a pipe line under government ownership. He knows better than that. The government could not possibly start a pipe line this year and I will tell you why. If the government of Canada were to enter into a nationalization program for the building of a pipe line today it would be up against the problem of getting a supply of gas and I am telling you they would have a very difficult time getting a supply of gas.

**Mr. Ellis:** So that's it.

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

**Mr. Knowles:** Aren't you a Canadian?

**Mr. Low:** I am a Canadian. I will tell you why the government would have a difficult time obtaining a supply of gas.

**An hon. Member:** Talk to the Alberta government.

**Mr. Low:** It is not a question of the Alberta government at all. If we can keep the goon gang quiet for a moment I will continue. I want to tell you briefly why the proposition of nationalization of the pipe line is untenable. I heard mention here today of a similarity between the Ontario hydro and a nationalized pipe line. There is no similarity at all. The fact of the matter is that in the case of Ontario hydro you have a government enterprise that manufactures the service and the product it has to sell to the consumer. In the case of a pipe line, if the government were foolish enough to try it, the government would not own the supply and it would have to make a deal with a dozen private enterprise producers in my province and other provinces in an effort to obtain a supply of gas.

Now, that is not all. If the government were ever foolish enough to attempt to go into the nationalization of a pipe line of this kind it would find itself confronted with the producers on the one hand. The producers are attempting to get a return on the risk capital they have put into the exploratory work to get gas. They want to have a fair return on that gas. All they ask is a fair return and I believe they are entitled to it just as the government of Saskatchewan has already acknowledged that private enterprise developing its oil and gas also wants a fair return. As I said, the government would be between that group and the great group of consumers in eastern Canada. Let us never forget that the producers in Alberta look upon the proposition this way.

The number of consumer voters in Canada would be 50, 60 or 100 times as numerous as the producer voters in this country. Whom are the government going to consider first in any case where it finds itself in a squeeze between the consumers and the producers? The producers of Alberta are quite certain that no government with any sense of reality would put itself between a group of consumers 50 times as numerous as the group of producers and have to make a decision as between the two groups with respect to price.

The producers in Alberta do not want to be in that position. I do not want them to be in that position and the government does not want them to be in that position. For that