

Alberta Natural Gas Company

best business these two companies have ever enjoyed out of Edmonton has been the transportation of oil in the last two or three years, yet they stand idly aside and see this transportation business taken from them by these American firms. To me, it is an amazing situation. These railways have the transportation know-how; they have the rights of way; they have the bridges and tunnels which could easily carry these lines. The same section crews that maintain a railway could easily maintain the pipe line right of way, yet these companies have decided to stand idly by. I do not think the Canadian Pacific would have stood aside in the days of Shaughnessy, Smith, Van Horne. If they had applied for charters, we would not be worrying about an all-Canadian route across this country, or expressing concern about developing Canada in the Canadian pattern for they were Canadians interested in developing Canada. If that view had been adopted at the time the Canadian Pacific railway was built, we would not have this railroad across Canada today. It would have been more economical to take our wheat from Manitoba south to the American lines which were already built, and then across to the seaboard in that manner. It was because the government of that day thought it was in the interest of Canada to have a Canadian route that the Canadian Pacific was built across this barren land in northern Ontario to maintain and help Canadian development, even though the cost was far greater than building a route through to the United States.

A week or ten days ago the Minister of Resources and Development announced with pride that six of the provinces had signed an agreement which would bring the trans-Canada highway a step closer to reality. We are going to spend \$300 million on the building of that highway. When I say "we", I mean the people of Canada, federally and provincially, are going to spend \$300 million to have this Canadian route across the country. If the argument of some of these pipe line companies were to be heeded, it would be much cheaper for the people of Canada to continue taking their cars down to the United States, crossing the United States, and then going back up to Vancouver rather than spend \$300 million on this road. We decided, however, to have proper road facilities across the country as a factor in Canadian development.

I should like to use another example. Suppose that this gas, instead of being in Alberta, were in Montana, and the problem were the same, to get the gas down to Vancouver, Portland, Seattle and Tacoma, where the market is. Is anyone in this house so

naïve as to think that, under any circumstances, the people of the United States, even if it were half the cost to build through Canada, would loop a line up into Alberta and through British Columbia in that way? National pride and national development would insist that they build the line in the United States if they possibly could. That is exactly what they would do. We have already seen an example of that in the state of Washington just to the south of our province where President Roosevelt and the administrations both before him and since him have poured countless millions into the development of that area in order to give them power, the cheapest hydro power in the world out of the greatest hydro development in the world, Grand Coulee dam. That development of cheap power in that country has made that country bloom and blossom. They have the cheapest power in America and have built industry and agriculture on that power. If to that cheap power is now added cheap gas, our province of British Columbia which, after all, is their natural competitor, will certainly lag far behind. They may have cheap power, but we should have the full benefit of this cheap gas, which is a Canadian resource.

Some of the eastern members think this is a feud between the Conservatives, the C.C.F. and the government, although this is a private bill. Let me give hon. members from Ontario an illustration which may help them understand the real position. Suppose gas were found at Windsor and that it was decided to be desirable to get it to Toronto for industrial use in that area. How many Ontario members would there be who would think the route should be built the American way, south of Lake Erie? Even if the route to the south of Lake Erie, through the states and up to Toronto, was a little bit cheaper, how many Ontario members would think the route should be built in that way? You would naturally demand to have developed within Canada this Canadian resource, with of course the obvious addendum that if we had a surplus, then it should be exported to the United States.

The most significant thing, however, in Mr. Dixon's evidence was this. I think we can all dismiss the other company which I noticed in the papers was described as an also-ran. As I say, the most significant thing was the fact that although Mr. Dixon mentioned in an offhand way the southern Canadian routes, and described how economically impossible they were, he said his company had never surveyed what any engineer, looking back in railway history, would have said was the most obvious route, the