

Prairie Transmission Lines

of taxation and other revenue. That is the only place where a complete social security program can be totally financed.

That, if I may say so, is one of the things which I dislike and deplore about the kind of talk that is going on and the kind of things the hon. member for Mackenzie is saying. If any legislation which is recommended by this committee is still on a dominion-provincial basis, then we will not have solved the problem, and we will not have complete social security.

Mr. Cote (Verdun-La Salle): What about British Columbia?

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

An hon. Member: What about Alberta?

Mr. Knowles: We live in Canada; don't you?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS**PRAIRIE TRANSMISSION LINES LIMITED**

The house resumed, from Friday, March 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Benidickson for the second reading of Bill No. 9, to incorporate Prairie Transmission Lines Limited.

Mr. D. S. Harkness (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, a week ago, when I spoke for a few minutes on this bill, I indicated that my opposition to its passage is on the same grounds on which I opposed it last year, namely, that the route to be followed is not indicated. As a matter of fact all indications are that the company intend to build the major portion of the pipe line through the United States if they can secure the necessary permits and permission. I think this is abundantly shown by the fact that the company in its original application for a charter set out the route it was going to follow. On November 22, 1949, during the discussion of this bill, I read their application into the record, and it is to be found at page 2094 of *Hansard* for that date. I will not take the time to read the application again, except to refer to that part of it which deals with the route and reads as follows:

... 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 . . .

The company indicated the route clearly at the time they made their original application, and evidently they were then under the impression that they needed to specify it although subsequently, as I have said, it was not included in the bill which was submitted to us. In addition to that fact, the sponsor of the bill in introducing it a week ago today indicated that the company still wished to build the pipe line via this route. At the same time he said that the company was willing to build it wholly in Canada if they were forced to do so. He went on to speak of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, the Alberta government and the Minister of Trade and Commerce from whom it would be necessary to secure permits before the company could build the line.

I think that establishes the point that the company will build the route through the United States unless they are forced to build it in Canada. From the first my contention has been that the primary step necessary to make sure that the route is constructed in Canada is for it to be specified in the bill which the house will pass, and that it should not pass unless an all-Canadian route is specified therein. I should like to refer to some remarks which the sponsor made when he introduced the bill a week ago. At page 445 of *Hansard* for March 3, 1950, he said:

It is of primary importance, however, to see that the interests of Canada are protected in connection with this project.

On the next page there are these words:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the interests of Canada in this matter? I suggest that the primary requirement is to see that potential Canadian consumers are provided for before any gas is exported.

I agree thoroughly with those statements, but all along my contention has been that the interests of Canada can only be served if the route is an all-Canadian one. To begin with, it seems perfectly obvious that the requirement which the sponsor of the bill has laid down, namely, that potential Canadian consumers should be provided for before any gas is exported, can only be met if the pipe line is constructed so as to serve the maximum number of Canadian consumers. There is no question that an all-Canadian route is going to bring gas to far more Canadian communities and thus far more Canadian people than one the major portion of whose length is on the United States side of the border.

In addition to that, once the gas leaves Canada and enters the United States it