

gasoline industry in the United States, caused by the over-production of gasoline and the various tax evasion rackets which in turn resulted in the price of United States gasoline falling far below the relative movements in crude oil prices." Now, I say, if you can lay down gasoline from the Dutch West Indies at Montreal just as cheaply as you can from the United States, is the industry demoralized in the Dutch West Indies?

Mr. BAKER: That is not a question for the auditor.

Mr. STANLEY: The evidence in regard to the Dutch West Indies given by the Shell Oil Company showed that it had no relation to the standard or listed posted prices of crude in the mid-continent field. They were subsidiary companies pure and simple.

Mr. DONNELLY: Excuse me if I differ with you there, because he said he paid the same price from the Dutch West Indies as at the gulf ports. He particularly said that he bought from the Dutch West Indies at the same price as the gulf ports, and the Dominion government did not appraise for duty and did not apply any dump when they bought at the gulf ports price. Those are his exact statements.

Mr. SMOKE: Put the motion, Mr. Chairman, and get through with it.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, on this question I do not think the motion should be made. There is no motion. This is simply evidence that this witness has given—

The CHAIRMAN: The auditor?

Mr. BOTHWELL: The same as any other witness giving evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is to adopt the report not the evidence being given by the witness. We have been discussing the question of gasoline since March 8th. We have had witnesses from everywhere connected with the gasoline industry in Canada. We have had the broadest possible enquiry and it is quite conceivable that if we went on the way we are going, allowing everybody to ask any question regarding the industry anywhere, we would not get through this enquiry for six months. The auditor was given specific instructions in his reference, covering the resolution of the House of Commons. He has made his investigation, made his findings and made his report. Now the question is, shall this report be adopted? Is that the pleasure of the committee?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, I submit with all due deference to the mover and seconder of the motion, that that practice has never taken place in any committee of this House or anywhere else. I submit that Mr. Matthews is presenting us with evidence; he is presenting us with his evidence in the shape of a report and he is subject to such questions as the members of the committee might care to ask. To adopt the report of the witness would be to adopt the evidence of a witness, and it would be just the same as taking the evidence of any other witness. What this committee must do is take Mr. Matthews' evidence and all the other evidence that has been given, and make a finding and report our findings on the evidence to the House. I submit with all deference you cannot adopt this report. I submit the committee would be substituting Mr. Matthews for this committee, if they adopted Mr. Matthews' report. I do not think any such motion was ever made before in any committee that has ever been formed by the House of Commons. Mr. Matthews is just simply an expert asked to give expert evidence. I have no doubt he has given evidence in court thousands of times in that capacity; and I will undertake to say no judge ever said, "I will take Mr. Matthews' evidence" until he came to make his decision, and then not without discussing his evidence back and forth. I am not in any way reflecting on Mr. Matthews, but I submit this is not the proper procedure to take at this time. Mr. Matthews is in the same position as any other witness. The committee when considering its report, might decide to take the evidence of