

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Connolly you are not going to operate outside of Canada?

Mr. CONNOLLY: This is a continuous line. The line beyond Canada of course will be—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CONNOLLY:—operated by Northwest Gas Company.

Mr. HODGSON: I think you will all agree that this is the first time I have had a chance to speak on this thing. I intended to before but somebody else always got the floor.

Mr. SMITH: You are big enough to get your own floor.

Mr. HODGSON: I think it has been proved here by Mr. Dixon and others that there will be only one pipe line built. I think that has been proven beyond a doubt,—although this is the second charter. I was wondering, therefore, if there is any collusion between these two companies, or if the other company had pledged more or less that they would have the Canadian route.

Now it looks to me that the natural route or the cheapest route is the one down through the States. The difference of \$15,000,000 is not just peanuts. It is the difference between one and the other. There might be such a thing as a hook-up between the companies so far as competition is concerned.

It has been proven that only one line is necessary or is all that will be built. Then, if two charters are granted, they still cannot say there is going to be any competition as far as buying gas is concerned. It also means that there is not going to be any competition as far as sales to markets are concerned—and that is the only thing that is going to stop a monopoly—that or some legislation we pass before this charter goes through.

The next step, as far as I can see it, lies with the Board of Transport Commissioners or the Minister of Trade and Commerce—whoever has the authority to say whether this charter is granted or not and where it will go at that time.

I think Mr. Smith proved to you this thing of gas being sent back and forth over the lines is just the same as other fuel and it has been refused in the past. I think Mr. Green is quite in order; I think he has got the right idea. Before we sell our birthright, we should have something to say about how much coal there is for our own consumption in Canada. I think that is only fair. I do not think that any legitimate company in the United States would object—in dealings with them I have never found them difficult in that way.

I think we should consider this very fairly from their standpoint and our own and that of the industries and the people of Canada as a whole. It has been said here that there is only to be so much gas left for Vancouver. We do not know what the development in the future is going to be along the location of this pipe line and the cities and towns which it services. Canada might need a great deal more gas than any of us now contemplate. For those reasons I think that the amendment that Mr. Green has made should be considered.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. BYRNE: I certainly oppose the amendment for the following reasons: in the first place the Export Act for natural gas and fluids does not call for it; secondly, the West Coast Transmission Company who have applied and obtained a charter to supply gas do not have such a clause in their charter; third, if you open up such a question every company that is chartered for gas and oil or any other exportable product would be left in the position where someone could come into the House of Commons and, possibly for political reasons or other reasons, introduce an amendment which would be similar. I think we could start something which would extend almost to infinity for all these voluminous bills that we have in the House of Commons. My fourth reason is that in the letters to the mayor or the city clerk of the city of Vancouver the Rt. Honourable Mr. C. D. Howe has indicated that as Minister of Trade and Commerce he will