

Unemployment

gas to sell nor places to sell it in eastern Canada. They had no contracts, nor did they have the finances with which to build the line. What did the United States federal power commission, which according to the statement of opinion expressed by Mr. Heeney on behalf of this government was opposed to Canadian gas, do? They did not throw out the application. They said that they are not going to throw out the Trans-Canada application for the import of gas into Minneapolis. They believed that to do so would sound the death knell of the Trans-Canada project to the possible economic detriment of both Canada and the United States. In other words, the United States federal power commission, with a far greater knowledge of oil and gas matters I am afraid than is evidenced by this government in Ottawa, kept this project alive in the hope that Canada would use common sense and allow the gas to be marketed in an economic way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we then come to Mr. Heeney's speech of last night, and against that we must weigh another statement made by this government last Friday and Saturday, which is reported in a number of newspapers in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member embarks upon quoting again from the statement, perhaps he would care to be informed that his time has elapsed.

Mr. Nickle: I appreciate that my time has run out. I might say that during last Wednesday's portion of this address approximately half of my time was taken up by interruptions. I would appreciate it if the house would give me its permission to carry on for a few more minutes to complete this statement.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Philpott: May I ask the hon. member a question? Would the hon. member say that the decision of the federal power commission was designed to make sure of getting enough gas for the United States or was it designed to prevent Canada from building a pipe line where Canada wants to build it?

Mr. Nickle: No, the decision of the United States federal power commission was based upon the recognition that the mutual interests of both Canada and the United States would be served by a little greater degree of co-operation on gas than this government has seen fit to allow.

Mr. Prudham: May I be permitted to ask the hon. member a question?

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. Speaker: May I point out that the hon. member's time has expired, and if unanimous consent is not given he cannot continue. If before that question is decided hon. members ask questions, naturally he will have to answer them. We are not in committee. I do not think that the hon. member can say that half of his time was taken up by interruptions. I have before me pages 2324 and 2325 of *Hansard* for March 23, 1955.

Mr. Nickle: Well, about ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. gentleman unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. McIvor: I should like permission to ask the hon. member who has just taken his seat a question.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Ferguson: There would be no more sense to it than we get from this government.

Mr. McIvor: I was going to ask the hon. member what the Alberta government, which is making millions out of oil, is going to do to make the construction of a Canadian pipe line possible?

Mr. Nickle: I should like to answer that question because I believe it is one of the most important questions asked in this house on this subject for a long time. I am going to answer it this way. I have heard the so-called oil millionaires in the west charged with killing the trans-Canada project. Let me answer it this way. The price of gas in Toronto, that is the average price at which gas will be sold in the 1955-56 season, is \$2.64 per thousand feet. Out of that the Canadian government will collect in income tax about 22 cents a thousand feet. Out of it also the municipal, provincial and federal governments will collect another 20 cents per thousand feet in other forms of tax. Out of that \$2.64 per thousand feet, which is the average cost of gas to the consumer in Toronto, the producers who bear all the risks of exploration and the Alberta government which owns these oil resources will actually share five cents per thousand feet or 2 per cent of the price the consumers in Toronto will pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we had butter sold at \$1 per pound in Toronto, I am sure the butter producers would set up a merry old fuss if they were asked to accept 2 per cent of the official price of that product. I am sure that if this government is satisfied it is entitled to 22 cents out of that price of \$2.64, then the producer and the government of