

Alberta Natural Gas Company

Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra): Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks on third reading of the bill I express regret that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) is not in his seat because I propose to say a few words about the stand he has taken. The fact that he is not here, however, is not my fault. This afternoon we saw him come into the chamber and, when he rose to speak, lose his temper and make quite a few rather violent remarks which I think clearly showed his attitude on the whole question. It is a very touchy subject not only for the Minister of Trade and Commerce but also for the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) who has lost his temper twice during the debate on these measures.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce made certain remarks as to what he would do and how he would deal with this question at the proper time.

Hon. members should remember that less than a year ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who sits for the riding of Port Arthur, brushed aside the representations of the people of that riding and allowed the main oil pipe line to by-pass the Canadian lakehead cities of Port Arthur and Fort William and go instead across the United States boundary to Superior, Wisconsin, where tankage and docks are to be installed, so that Americans will get the jobs that should have been available to Canadians. Having done that last year, I do not expect him to give any special consideration to the wishes of the people of British Columbia in connection with this natural gas pipe line to the west coast.

The issue is now abundantly clear; it is whether or not there is to be an all-Canadian route for this natural gas to the west coast. In other words, are the requirements of the Canadian people to be met before the requirements of those Americans living in the north-west United States? All the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) or the Minister of Trade and Commerce had to do at any time during this debate was announce that this main pipe line would be routed to the west coast in Canadian soil. Had that been done there would have been no further debate. However, they have been very careful not to give any such assurance.

This afternoon, by way of summing up, I propose to set out some of the reasons why this question of an all-Canadian route is of importance to the people of British Columbia, and I hope to conclude my remarks with a few reasons as to why the issue is also of great importance to all Canadians, no matter in which province they happen to live. In the first place this proposed development is

not of a minor nature. I have here a dispatch which appeared in the Vancouver *Province* of April 22 summing up very clearly just what this development means to the west coast. This is the report of a meeting of purchasing agents of public utility companies in British Columbia and also the states of Washington and Oregon, and the first paragraph reads:

Purchasing agents from three of the largest public utility corporations on the west coast agreed today that the proposed natural gas pipe line from Alberta would be the major economic development of the decade for the Pacific northwest.

One speaker, who came from the United States, said:

With the introduction of natural gas, the amount of potential energy that will come through this pipe line will be the practical equivalent of the power energy now coming from Coulee and Bonneville.

Those are two immense power dams in the states of Washington and Oregon. Then the statement by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Vancouver five days ago clearly showed the great importance of the development. He said it looked as though an oil pipe line would follow the gas line to Vancouver. That may very well be of greater importance than the gas pipe line itself. The Vancouver *Sun*, which has the largest circulation of any newspaper west of Toronto and which has been a staunch supporter of this government ever since I can remember, had an editorial dealing with that statement by the minister, headed "It must be all-Canadian." It is dated May 12, and the first paragraph says:

Mr. Howe's revelation that an oil pipe line from the Alberta oil fields to the Pacific coast may follow the gas pipe line makes it all the more necessary that the gas pipe line should follow an all-Canadian route.

Then it goes on:

Think what it would mean if the suggested oil pipe line followed an American route.

The oil from Alberta would be pumped to tide-water at Seattle or Tacoma and there refined for shipment or shipped crude. There would be jobs for Americans—but what of Canadians?

Canadians should demand that a policy of "Canada first" be adopted. If refineries are to be built and shipping development to take place as a result of the exploitation of Canada's resources, the ports and workers of Canada must have preference.

That is really the essence of our argument, that Canadians must have first call on Canadian resources. That was the main ground on which a few weeks ago the legislature of British Columbia unanimously adopted a resolution advocating a route through the Yellowhead pass. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce seem to have paid no attention at all to that resolution; yet there it is, setting out the reasons and supported by all parties in that legislature. I think perhaps that