

*Prairie Transmission Lines*

I understand the company has indicated that they are prepared to build a line through the southern part of British Columbia entirely within Canada if it is necessary to get the charter. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in view of their original application, their purpose is to build a line as they have indicated. From what I have been able to gather I do not think they have surveyed any route in the southern part of Canada close to the United States-British Columbia border. I doubt very much whether the building of a pipe line through that area is a practical proposition. I think that it would have to go considerably north of that to get country through which they could go with any degree of ease. In this connection I should like to point out that you cannot build a pipe line without a road. Judging from the two or three summers that I spent in that area of southern British Columbia I do not think any roads exist along the lines that I understand this company have said they would build their line. I do not think it would be a practical proposition for them, or for any other company, to construct roads there, which again is necessary, to enable them to build a pipe line. Therefore it seems to me that this is an application essentially for a pipe line to run its greater length through the United States, and to that there are serious objections.

Discussing this bill or the other bill—I do not know which it was—the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) said that he was all in favour of a pipe line which ran through Canadian territory and that he would ensure that Canadian interests were served first in granting a permit to any company to export gas and so on along that line. I do not think that an assurance of that kind is sufficient for us who are granting the charter to set aside the considerations I have mentioned and then let the thing slide. After all, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not going to be in his present position forever. It should not be a matter of accepting his assurance that he will see that no permit is granted unless Canadian interests are served first. The general objections to a pipe line, the greater part of whose length runs through the United States from Alberta out to the Pacific coast of Canada or the Pacific coast of the United States, I outlined when I was speaking on the other pipe line bill some time ago, and I do not want to repeat what I said then or go over the matter in detail; but I should like to summarize some of the reasons. The first is that with such a pipe line the minimum number of people will be served in British Columbia and Alberta. That of course is self-evident. If you run a line through only

a small section of Alberta, the southern part of it, and a small section of British Columbia so that it crosses to the United States, and then run it back up straight south of Vancouver, it is quite clear that you are going to serve far fewer people than if you ran its entire length on Canadian territory.

Second, it will not result in any development of the northern parts of Alberta and British Columbia. In northern Alberta and in northern British Columbia there are large regions which are sparsely settled and require roads and power.

**Mr. Murray (Cariboo):** And railways.

**Mr. Harkness:** And railways, somebody said. One of the ways in which those areas can be developed is by building a pipe line there. The construction of a pipe line from the Peace river area in Alberta through the Peace river block in British Columbia, and thence on down to Vancouver, would open up a large track of land which at the present time needs development. It would provide power in that area, and as a result would attract large numbers of settlers.

The very building of the pipe line would cause the construction of roads, one of the great necessities in that area. I think probably it would lead eventually to the construction of a railway, or railways. The third important consideration is that if the main part of the construction were in the United States a great deal of the wages and employment for the construction of the pipe line would be paid to American workmen in American funds. In other words it would mean a great deal less employment in this country and less money in circulation. And after a line is built, of course there must be people to maintain it. Similarly if the greatest length of the pipe line is in the United States the people maintaining it will be Americans. The wages paid will be spent in the United States, and we shall derive no benefit at all.

Another consideration is that no impetus is given to the development of manufacturing industries in this country by the construction of a pipe line, most of the length of which lies in another country. I am given to understand that if the line is built chiefly in Canada it will cause the construction of at least one steel rolling plant and one plant for the manufacture of fittings and various sorts of valves. All of this would increase the amount of employment and the amount of money in circulation here, in addition to which it would save large sums in American exchange.

One other important consideration is that if the pipe line is built entirely in this country