

Prairie Transmission Lines

will be given to new drilling. One way in which that will be done will be by the amount of road construction which will be necessary, and this will open up new areas. As a result, people will be able to get into places where they cannot get at the present time. The story of the search for oil is also to some extent the story of the search for gas. If a pipe line runs close to a certain area which it is possible to develop as an oil-producing area, even if oil is not found in large quantities but gas is discovered, a considerable amount of drilling will result in such areas. When there is no market for the gas, or no market to which the gas can be taken, such areas are left undeveloped.

The fifth point I should like to make is that the Canadian route will mean that the cost to the Canadian consumer in British Columbia will be less than if the route were built in the United States. I have already dealt with that point, so I will not enlarge upon it.

The sixth point is this: The competitive position of the manufacturers using gas will be advantageous as compared with the same type of manufacturer in the United States coast cities. I have dealt with that point tonight, too.

Number 7: More American dollars will be earned by having a Canadian route. I believe that point was dealt with in the article which I read from the *Albertan*. It indicated that with the Canadian route some \$14,500,000 in American funds would be earned in transportation costs. With a route chiefly in the United States, you would probably have a proportion of approximately \$3 million in United States currency for transportation costs, and the remainder of the transportation costs would be paid in the United States. The advantage of receiving that amount of United States dollars, considering our present trade situation and the adverse balance with the United States, is important in itself.

The eighth point I should like to make is that it will be a distinct advantage from the defence point of view to have the line in Canada. The construction of wartime factories in the mountains, which could make use of a source of cheap power of this kind, might be a distinct advantage. Certainly it is a considerable advantage to have that cheap and vital type of fuel available in the interior of our country, rather than having to depend upon other fuels for our power. This applies particularly, of course, to inland British Columbia points, such as Kamloops, Trail and so on.

I should like now to say something about another point. Last year, and again this session, speakers have been arguing that we should pass this bill, and that the route is

[Mr. Harkness.]

none of our business. They say that is a matter for the board of transport commissioners, for the Alberta government, and for the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe). We have not anything to do with it. All we have to do is grant a charter or not grant a charter.

I think nothing could be farther from the truth. In matters of this sort, the members of parliament have a responsibility to see that no charter is granted which may be used to dissipate Canadian resources, or which would result in action being taken which would be injurious to the various parts of this country. In this case, I am referring particularly to British Columbia. It seems to me that as members of this house we must decide whether the route should be indicated in the bill. It is not possible to move an amendment to that effect at this time; if it were I would do so. It is also our responsibility to decide whether the route of the pipe line should be Canadian.

Some hon. members have said that they will vote for second reading in order to get this bill into committee so that the matter of route and other things may be discussed in detail. In view of what has been indicated so far this year, and in view of what was indicated last session by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe), I have no doubt that the bill will be pushed through. If the bill should go to committee I am sure that the information given to hon. members will be along the lines I have indicated and will show clearly that all the advantages are with the Canadian route. If hon. members are not satisfied with the information they are given, if a Canadian route is not specified, then I hope they will oppose the bill if it should come back to this house for third reading.

Mr. A. F. Macdonald (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Edmonton East, which constituency is located in the midst of the most productive oil fields in the province of Alberta, I rise to express my concern that a small minority in this house should attempt to delay the business of the country. This minority is controlling our right to vote on the question we are now discussing. This minority is not allowing us to proceed with public bills and private members' resolutions which I believe are most important to this country. I submit that hon. members of this house should now be permitted to register their opinion on this matter, and I move, seconded by the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Welbourn):

That the question be now put.

Mr. G. R. Pearkes (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, at the last session of parliament the Prime