

*Alberta Natural Gas Company*

to Kingsgate. That to me makes it plain that their plans were based on the United States route. In addition I noticed that all those letters were of recent date, late March, early April, late April. They had been gathered together quickly, to show us that these people were really interested in Canada, and that they were going to buy all these materials here. None of the letters had been written last session. These people put on a very good show of giving us an opportunity to choose one of five routes, and in trying to convince us that naturally they were going to buy Canadian materials and, if so ordered, would build the route in Canada.

I am still opposed to these bills unless they are amended. I want to quote the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in reply to questions asked by the hon. member for Yorkton and the hon. member for Fraser Valley, to show the lack of definition and, shall I say, the doubt in our minds. At page 791 of *Hansard* for March 16, 1950, I find this:

Mr. A. C. Stewart (Yorkton): I should like to direct the following questions to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Have any representations been made to him by the C.C.F. government of Saskatchewan with regard to protecting Saskatchewan so far as export of oil and gas from Alberta is concerned? What is the policy of the minister with regard to the granting of permits for pipe lines from Alberta to the United States?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The answer to the first question is that I have no knowledge of any representations from the province of Saskatchewan in that connection. In answer to the second question I would say that I spoke on this subject at the last session of parliament, and pointed out that the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act is designed to protect Canadian consumers. It is necessary under the act for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to give a certificate to the effect that the present and foreseeable future needs of Canada are protected before any exports of electricity or gas are permitted. It has been suggested frequently in the current debate that gas will be sent to the United States from the pipe line before the pipe line reaches Vancouver. I stated last session that that would not be permitted. I know from discussions with the sponsors of the pipe line that it is not proposed to undertake any such export.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley was not present at the time the question was asked, and wanted the matter clarified. So on March 17, at page 850 of *Hansard*, he asked this question:

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I was not in the house yesterday when the orders of the day were called, but I note that the minister is reported on page 792 of *Hansard* as having said:

"It has been suggested frequently in the current debate that gas will be sent to the United States from the pipe line before the pipe line reaches Vancouver. I stated last session that that would not be permitted. I know from discussions with the sponsors of the pipe line that it is not proposed to undertake any such export."

[Mr. Herridge.]

Am I to understand from that statement that no export permit will be granted other than through an all-Canadian route?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Several members of the house have given information that they obtained from the principals behind the bill, and I have given information that I obtained from the principals behind the bill. I might say that I cannot understand the unnatural fear that certain hon. members have of letting these men come before a committee of the house where members of the house could find out what they intend to do.

Mr. Cruickshank: I take it the minister is not going to answer my question. Is that correct?

We must bear in mind those statements together with the letter read this evening by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, written by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the clerk of the corporation of Vancouver, in which it was emphatically stated that the sponsors of the bill had assured the minister that the line was to proceed on Canadian soil, or words to that effect. In view of those apparently definite statements and in view of the answers given by Mr. Dixon on behalf of the company, as outlined by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, would any average person say we were unreasonable in doubting that in reality one of five or six routes is going to be chosen and that all these routes are being treated on an absolutely equal basis at the present time? The members of the committee who are in opposition to these bills are definitely of the opinion that certain interests are very much in favour of that route going through the United States; and we are also of the opinion that the examination before the committee and the proceedings of the committee were just a form of going through the motions. Because we believe that and because we are determined to do the best we can to protect the rights of the people of British Columbia, as well as the rights of the Canadian people, we are determined to oppose these bills, unless they are amended so that those rights are protected now and in the future.

Mr. Sinclair: I should like to say a few words on this bill at this time. In view of the fact that I am a parliamentary assistant, I should state that I am not speaking either for or against the government, but I am speaking as the member for Coast-Capilano on a private bill. I have only spoken once in two years in this pipe-line debate, because I did not want it inferred in any way that I was taking part in what certainly appeared to be a filibuster, since the same information was repeated again and again.

When I spoke a year ago, I said that I would vote for these bills on second reading so that we could have the actual facts obtained before the standing committee, not