

Supply—Transport

period of 1940-45 when, had it not been for assistance received by way of oil from our good neighbour to the south of us, this country would have been dry, so far as oil is concerned.

An hon. Member: They looked after themselves first.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): I live on the international border line. Down there I know that the oil allocated to Canadians along that border was more liberal in supply than to the citizens of the state of Maine. The pipe line going through the United States is the economical procedure to take. Why try to pipe oil from Alberta to Ontario and Quebec or the maritime provinces when it can go across the border at some point within a reasonable distance, and the oil we require in this section could come back across the border from the United States? I fail to understand why there is all this great worry about Canadian oil going to our friends to the south of us, when they have supplied 90 per cent of the oil brought to this country for years and years.

I have a friendly feeling toward the people down there, because they have done much to help us. Were it not for our neighbour to the south of us, we could not dispose of anything from the section of Canada in which I live. No one in central Canada wishes to buy the commodities or natural products of the maritimes. We are obliged to go to these people to sell what we have to offer. They have been very kind and considerate. If at this moment we are in the fortunate position where we could let some of our oil go south, it would only in some small way repay for some of the good things those people have done for us.

Mr. Cruickshank: My name has been brought into this discussion. I happen to have had the privilege, which my hon. friend did not have, of being born in the United States. Let me tell my hon. friend however that we do not owe the United States any more than they owe us.

The argument advanced by the hon. member is not as good as the delicious lobsters served in his district. They are good, but his argument is ridiculous. We have been the best customer of the United States. I well remember a brilliant young friend of mine in British Columbia, whose name I shall not mention, stating that our fish should be canned here, and our logs processed—and I know my hon. friend from the maritime provinces is particularly interested in fish and would like to have them canned in the maritimes. Why should not our oil be used within the province? I do not care which company is concerned, I submit that that

should be done. Last year I sponsored a bill for a certain company, but I repeat that I do not care which company is concerned. This pipe line should go through Canada and serve the best part of Alberta and northern and central British Columbia and then the remainder of the oil could be sent to the United States. Is there anything unreasonable about that?

An hon. Member: Which is the best part of Alberta?

Mr. Cruickshank: I do not know, but I know which is the best part of British Columbia. The hon. member from a small district in the maritimes which is close to the United States border where the poor mounted police are working day and night to see that cigarettes and other things are not smuggled should not be talking to me about the development of Canada. All I am asking is that these pipe lines should go through Canada, no matter what company it is, so that this country may be developed. I know the premier of British Columbia has told us that there are immense resources in northern British Columbia still undeveloped.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): The hon. member says that this pipe line should go through Canada, but what if the people in the United States had used that same argument about the pipe line coming up to Montreal? What if during the war the United States people had said that they wanted that pipe line to go through United States territory instead of going through to serve Montreal?

The Deputy Chairman: I would remind the committee that we are dealing with item 454, board of transport commissioners for Canada, administration, maintenance and operation. Because of the relationship of pipe lines to the board of transport commissioners some hon. members have taken the opportunity to ask the minister some questions. However, I am afraid that hon. members are now anticipating a bill that is to come before the house. I would ask hon. members to co-operate with the Chair and confine their discussion to the item now before the committee.

Mr. Cruickshank: I shall be glad to bow to your ruling but Imperial Oil will hear from me in the future.

Mr. Gillis: I agree with what you have just said. I think the time for this discussion was during the last session when seven or eight bills to incorporate these different companies were up for consideration. That is when these arguments should have been advanced. I remember standing in my place to protest against those bills and using practically all the arguments that are being used