

Prairie Transmission Lines

direction of this parliament it was ordered in the last session that routes must be decided upon by the board of transport commissioners. I think hon. members are also aware that public interest is additionally protected in that the province of Alberta has established most effective control now of its natural resources in the form of oil and natural gas.

Then at page 1345 he is reported to have said:

I should like to inform the house that the bill has nothing to do with routes.

In that connection I should like to put on record what this company had to say in the matter of routes when it first applied for its charter. I have here a small clipping from the *Calgary Herald* of August 11, 1949, which reads as follows:

Notice of application to the parliament of Canada for a private bill.

Notice is hereby given that an application will be made to the parliament of Canada at the next or the following session thereof for a private bill incorporating a company under the name of Prairie Pipe Lines Limited or in the alternative Prairie Transmission Lines Limited or such other name as parliament may grant for the purpose of acquiring, constructing and operating pipe lines to transport or transmit natural and artificial gas and oil in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia commencing at a point in the general Calgary area in the province of Alberta and thence to a point in the vicinity of Blairmore in the said province and thence to a point in the vicinity of Kingsgate in the province of British Columbia and thence to the United States of America, leaving Canada at a point at or near Kingsgate in the said province of British Columbia and re-entering Canada in the vicinity of Blaine in the state of Washington and proceeding north to Vancouver area in the province of British Columbia, subject to the provisions of the Pipe Lines Act.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario, this 4th day of June, 1949.

J. G. Edison,
Solicitor for the applicants,
907 Victory Building,
Toronto, Ontario.

I should just like to say further that Blaine, which is mentioned there, is straight south of Vancouver. In other words, this company, whose charter is now up for us to pass upon, as far as this house is concerned, in their original application to this parliament outlined the route, and they left no doubt whatever what that route was. The route was to go into the United States really at the nearest point possible to take it into the United States from the Pincher Creek gas field in southern Alberta, thence to travel through the United States, and then they were going to have a branch line up to Vancouver from Blaine immediately south of Vancouver.

It is quite true that the route was not mentioned when the bill actually came before us in the house, but I think a reading of this notice of application which the company made in the first instance is sufficient proof

[Mr. Harkness.]

that their purpose and their idea is to build a pipe line which is going to travel through the greater part of its length in the United States of America.

In spite of what the mover said to the effect that the granting of this charter had nothing to do with this route, we have to keep very much in mind the matter of what route the company does propose to build its line over. It seems, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, that the question of route is perhaps the most important consideration so far as the pipe line charter is concerned.

A considerable number of arguments have already been put forward in the house along this line, that a pipe line company should include in its application the route which it is to follow in the same way as a railway company does. With that I agree most completely. I do not think that this parliament should pass any pipe line bill, or grant any charter, unless the route or approximate route is outlined.

Essentially the situation is this. At the last session of parliament a pipe line or a pipe line charter to take gas to the Pacific coast was granted. It is quite true that that charter contained approximately the same words as the one now before us. The route was not outlined. However, when that charter was discussed in the committee at that time—and it is quite true that it was given a cursory examination there—it was late in the session. There was no time to go into the matter in the detail that it should have been gone into. In any event, the projected plans of that company were outlined to the committee. It was definitely established that that company intended to put, and it secured the charter for the purpose of putting, a pipe line from the Peace river country down through the interior of British Columbia to Vancouver, and extending a line from there on to the Pacific coast cities of the United States.

Probably if we had not been in such a rush at that time the considerations which have been brought forward in the debate on this bill and the other pipe line bill would have come out then. Probably no charter would have been granted unless the route had been included in the application of the company. The fact that that was not done is no good reason why it should not be done now and in the future. As I have indicated, this company actually did establish before the committee that their purpose was to build a route entirely within Canada. As far as the company with which we are dealing is concerned, as the notice of application which I have read indicates, their purpose is not to build it in Canada; it is to build the main part of the route within the United States.