

Boundary Pipeline Corporation

reinforcement, in my decision to continue the present course which is unalterably in opposition to the application presently before the committee.

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): Mr. Chairman, on a previous occasion you stated that this bill had been under consideration in the committee for about eight hours, and I imagine at least another hour has been added since then. It is an important measure, being one of a series of applications that have been made to the house during the past three years dealing with a natural product of the province of Alberta which is likely to bring that province great prosperity.

Hon. members may wonder why I am interested, coming as I do from a province where we cannot expect ever to have a pipe line. Unless they invent some new way of transporting natural gas we shall never have any of it down there from Alberta. But we believe that what is going to make Alberta prosperous is going to make the rest of the country prosperous, and we hope to benefit indirectly. Everyone in the house and in the country is interested in seeing that the best possible solution is found for the transportation of natural gas from the locations where it may be discovered.

This bill was first introduced in the other place; it came to this house about March 13 and was then sent to the committee. I happened to be a member of the committee that dealt with that subject, but I was able to attend only one meeting. On account of the Easter vacation and not getting back in time I was not able to attend the other two meetings which were held immediately after the recess.

The bill before us is brought in by a firm of solicitors representing five gentlemen from the city of Regina, three solicitors and two businessmen, who are seeking incorporation by means of a statute. In other words they are looking for concessions from the government which are not available to ordinary persons without the sanction of parliament. They are desirous of getting authority to transport natural gas from the province of Alberta to the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan at the present time, and if other resources are discovered in the adjoining province of Saskatchewan they want the authority to transport the gas from there to the United States. Their intention was disclosed at the first meeting of the committee I attended, when it was stated that they wished to have authority to transport gas or oil through the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and outside Canada.

At this point I should like to draw attention to a statement by the hon. member for

Springfield the other evening, when he praised the hon. member for Fort William for introducing an amendment in the committee which he thought would preserve the natural gas for Canada. The amendment, as read by the hon. member for Springfield, is as follows:

That paragraph (a) of clause 6 be amended by inserting after the word "lines" in line 23 thereof the words: Provided that the main pipe line or lines for the transmission and transportation of gas and oil shall be located entirely within Canada.

The hon. member for Springfield approved of this amendment, which was debated at some length in the standing committee and which has no merit whatsoever because the main line must be in Canada even if the gas is going to be sold across the border in the United States. It was practically admitted in the committee by the sponsor of the bill that the gas would be brought as far as Winnipeg and from there down to the United States border where a connection would be made with the line of a United States company sponsored by the same people who are behind this legislation. Therefore I think the hon. member for Springfield was wrong in the praise he gave the hon. member for Fort William for introducing that amendment which in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of many members of the committee, has no effect so far as the route to be followed in the transportation of the gas is concerned.

The principal witness before the standing committee was a Mr. Herring of the Fish Engineering Corporation of Houston, Texas. This gentleman is undoubtedly a very clever engineer and was an excellent witness before the committee. He told us that his company was interested in building the line and that they had a lot of experience. Mr. Herring said, as found at page 12 of the report of the proceedings of the committee:

We have been very active in the Alberta gas picture, both with this company and with the Prairie Company, as mentioned by Mr. Green—and may I pause to qualify our company one step further. We as a company have built three of the major gas pipe lines in the United States, including the transcontinental gas pipeline system from the Mexican border to New York City; the line from Texas to Chicago; and Mr. Fish, president of the company, built, as vice-president of the company, the Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, which is the largest operating company of its kind in the field today.

It seemed to me that this man was very experienced and well qualified to construct a line, and certainly knew a great deal more about the business than most members of the committee. But there was a gentleman who was a member of the committee, the hon. member for Calgary West, who showed his great knowledge in the examination of this witness. It was not surprising that the hon.