

small views into this discussion whatsoever. We in British Columbia, especially those of us who are on the Pacific coast, must depend largely for our trading upon the United States, and I do not think we should try to put an amendment before this committee and use an argument of that type.

We have depended on the United States for years and years. I myself have worked with an Imperial Oil Refinery in the east and I know that we had to depend on the United States; and moreover, they have given us the automobiles which we have today which are gasoline driven. I do not think the honourable member should have used an argument along those lines to try to place an amendment before this committee.

And mention was made that no oil should go out of Canada until the Canadian need is fulfilled. We know that in the other bill which was passed in the House, mention was made of but two provinces in Canada, two provinces. I would like to stress this: does he mean that no export of gas can go out of the Dominion of Canada until Canadian needs are fulfilled?

Would that mean that we must wait for Winnipeg, and wait for London, Ontario, and Toronto to say: We need gas, but it cannot be exported until after the requirements of those particular cities and provinces are fulfilled from Alberta? Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is really ridiculous and I am not going to vote for it. I think these things should be brought out because we have heard these remarks before in regard to these oil bills.

A question was asked here yesterday, I think, where the same gentleman talked about bringing gas down through the Yellowhead and oil down through Kamloops and back through Kelowna and piped over the mountains to Trail, some ten hundred miles; but we have been told within the last few days by experts that it is practically impossible—not impossible perhaps, but certainly not a profitable thing to do. We have listened to many of these things and I think we should take objection and place it on the record. I have the chance to do so at this time, and I am against the amendment on this ground. Had the consumers anything to say on the coast regarding how much they are going to pay for gas? I think this bill is wide open the same as the other one and I think it has got to be determined by the board which route is going to be chosen.

These people have come here and offered us five routes and they are going to offer us a sixth route. Are we going to tie an amendment on a bill of that type? Mr. Green may stand up at the coast and tell the people that I was the cause of their paying \$1 million more for their gas than would otherwise have been the case. I hope that he does because we have been reading his remarks in the papers ever since this thing started.

Mr. GREEN: Go right ahead.

Mr. MOTT: I am sorry to hear Mr. Green make a remark of that type and to have him place it on the record here. Therefore, when this statement comes up for the vote, I shall vote against it and on this particular ground.

Mr. APPLEWAITE: I would like to speak to the amendment and directly to the amendment. I believe the amendment has been introduced with the one and only idea of protecting possible Canadian purchasers against export to the United States of gas which they, the Canadians, should have issued for them to use. That has already been done. I should now like to read to the committee a few short but appropriate sections of the Electricity and Fluid Exportations Act, being chapter 54 of the revised statutes of Canada 1927:

Section 5, subsection 1 reads as follows:

V. No person shall export any power or fluid without a licence, or any power or fluid in excess of the quantity permitted by his licence, or otherwise than as permitted by such licence.