

*Prairie Transmission Lines*

almost everyone in British Columbia that this should be an all-Canadian route; and it seems to me that if these facts were appreciated by the members of this house they also would be persuaded that the route should be all-Canadian.

Now I should like to turn to another phase of this matter. There is no question but that a gas pipe line from Alberta to the west coast will be a natural monopoly. Only one pipe line will be built; there is only a sufficient market for one line to justify the very high expenditure involved. Since that is the situation, and since it has now developed that there is sufficient gas to justify the construction of such a line—or at least assuming that to be the case—the main consideration facing us is where the pipe line should run, what should be its route in order to bring the maximum benefit to Alberta, to British Columbia and to Canada as a whole. It seems to me that is really the only important point we have to consider in connection with this or the other pipe line bill now before the house. These bills call for the incorporation of companies; but if we are to exercise any influence in relation to this extremely important matter of where the pipe line will run, our only opportunity to do so is before any charter is granted.

With regard to the best set-up as far as Alberta, British Columbia and Canada are concerned, I do not think there is any doubt but that it would consist of two things, first a gas-gathering system in Alberta, and second a pipe line to take out to the Pacific coast the gas so gathered. The gas-gathering system in Alberta of course would consist of pipe lines linking up the gas fields in the south with the field at Pincher Creek, then on to Turner valley and Jumping Pound west of Calgary, then on up to Edmonton, linking the numerous gas fields east and north of Edmonton, and then north again to the Peace river country in both Alberta and British Columbia. No matter where the pipe line may be built, I think there is no doubt but that a gas-gathering system of that sort will come into existence. The only question in that connection may be the extent of the gathering system.

The second main requirement is the pipe line to carry that gas to the market on the Pacific coast. It might run from anywhere along the length of that gathering system; but my contention is that, other things being equal, the farther north that pipe line runs the greater will be the advantage to us in Canada, for the reason particularly that the farther north it runs the more new country it will open up for development, not only in

the way of drilling oil and gas wells, but also the building of roads, railways, and the opening up of the area for agricultural purposes.

At the last session, I believe I made two or three speeches on this subject. At that time I outlined, as did various other people, the advantages of an all-Canadian route. These are so obvious that I think anyone who studies the subject is bound to be convinced that such a route is a must, so far as we are concerned. However, I should like to summarize those reasons. Some of them I have repeated tonight, so I will not expand upon those.

The first of these advantages is that a Canadian route will give the maximum number of Canadians a supply of natural gas; that is quite obvious. There is no question but that the more Canadian communities the line goes through, the more opportunities there are going to be to develop industries along that route, and the more people will be able to heat their houses and do their cooking with this cheap fuel. Second, control of the gas would remain in Canada until Canadian needs were satisfied. I have dealt with that question to some extent tonight. Third, more Canadian employment will result from the construction and maintenance of the pipe line, if the Canadian route is chosen. At the same time, more Canadian employment will be provided through the manufacture of pipe and fittings, things of that sort, in Canada. At a time such as this, when a considerable amount of unemployment has developed in this country, and when there is fear as to what the employment situation may become, it seems to me that any project which is going to increase the amount of employment in this country should be given the greatest consideration.

It is, of course, quite obvious that if three-quarters of the length of this pipe line is built in the United States, it is going to be built by American labour; the maintenance crews that keep the pipe line running afterwards are going to be American. All that employment will go to people in the United States, and not to Canadians. If the line is built in Canada, somewhere between two and three thousand Canadians will be given employment during the construction period which will cover two or three years. Then, the people who are required to maintain the line will have jobs indefinitely. In the same way, if three-quarters of the length of this pipe line is built in the United States, the pipe used in the construction of it, the various fittings and compressor stations, will all be manufactured in United States plants.

The fourth advantage is that more new country will be opened up by the building of this line in Canada. As a result, some stimulus