

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

Mr. Fleming: But has the hon. member ever heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce say the offer was a spurious offer?

Mr. Byrne: I have said that this project proposed by Mr. McMahon would export four-fifths of the entire amount of gas that has been permitted for export from the province of Alberta. Now what has become of the policy of Canadians being served first and foremost?

There has been a great deal of discussion regarding the control of the companies, and comparisons have been made between the McMahon offer and that of the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited. At least Trans-Canada Pipe Lines are proposing to move natural gas to eastern Canada. The McMahon proposal is to move gas to the United States. It may be true that with Trans-Canada more of the incidental profits will be paid to the bondholders in the United States, but in the other case much of the profit again will accrue to bondholders in the United States but there will be no gas in eastern Canada. We certainly may have control in Canada, but no gas. I should estimate that the great International Nickel Company in its smelters would use almost half of the amount of natural gas that would be left for consumption in eastern Canada should this proposal have been accepted.

That is not all. The proponents of Canada first at all costs, that is, mainly the official opposition, have said at all times that the main line must be built entirely within Canada. We have had bills passed here day after day, week after week, with the same silly argument being put forward. When a gathering company was being incorporated and gas or oil were being brought to one central location for transportation to a given area the official opposition have always insisted that the main line of the gathering system be built entirely within Canada to connect with the main transmission line regardless of whether it meant that the gathering line would be 100 or 200 miles longer. The principle is there.

What does Mr. McMahon propose in this case? Mr. McMahon finds that there are some basic faults in Trans-Canada's plan, and the third one is the following:

The Trans-Canada plan contemplates the sale of gas to Tennessee Gas Transmission Company and a subsidiary at Emerson, Manitoba, and Niagara Falls, Ontario. Gas sold at Emerson would be used by the Tennessee Company in the great plains-midwest area of the United States to invade the duly franchised market areas of the present pipe line companies . . .

Isn't that just too bad? It is going to interfere with some of his friends. But that is not all. I want to point out that the official oppos-

[Mr. Byrne.]

ition are supporting this proposal as the only alternative to the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Company. Mr. McMahon proposes to build a 34-inch pipe line to Winnipeg and a 30-inch pipe line from Winnipeg to eastern Canada. Where is the main line being built? Four-fifths of the natural gas is, according to his plan, to be sold in the United States and 100 million cubic feet per day is to go to eastern Canada in a smaller pipe. It would be very interesting to hear from the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra who has always felt that this principle must be maintained at all costs. I am waiting anxiously to hear what he has to say about this matter.

I should like to say one word about the question of closure. I have said earlier that this pipe line filibuster began in 1949. We went through it in the session of 1949 and the session of 1950. Two gas company charters were refused because of filibusters and the whole gas line policy of Canada was confused. The newspapers carried articles as long as four months ago indicating that the official opposition had stated they were going to filibuster this pipe line measure. One of their members even said that it would be an example of eternity, and certainly the members of the C.C.F. party have made similar statements. We are facing a position in which the minority are attempting to obstruct parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Fleming: That is what you said last year.

Mr. Byrne: This is a very important matter and it has been shown that unless the financing can be assured by the end of this month the pipe line policy will be further confused and will be for another two years. It is my opinion that we should pass the legislation and get on with the job that we were sent here to do.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, on one thing I am sure we can all agree this evening and that is that we have had a very interesting and exciting day. Perhaps if the House of Commons had days like this more frequently we would be far more popular with the general public in the galleries than we have been in the past. However, I should like to speak very seriously tonight on some features of the debate on the question before the house.

The first is that within a little over an hour the axe will fall and debate will be stopped on this stage of the measure. That action is unprecedented in the parliamentary history of Canada, and I am sure that when members on the other side of the house have the opportunity to think over what has been done in the last two days they will realize that a very