

to give them that right. There is no reason so far as we can see why they should have a wider right than the other companies who have been hoping to get a line to the west coast.

Mr. RILEY: Speaking to the amendment proposed by Mr. Herridge, in that amendment he asks that the company be restricted in the export of gas until the requirements of the Canadian consumers have been satisfied. Apparently he wanted to give the people of Canada who might be interested in the gas line, or in consuming gas from the Alberta wells, an opportunity to obtain that gas for their requirements before it could be exported across south of the border. He comes along with this amendment and he asks that the company be restricted from doing business in any other provinces than Alberta and British Columbia. There is another point for us to consider there, and that is that the two companies will have to go before the Board of Transport Commissioners, which after all is the body which is going to give them the power to carry on their project, their gas line project. These two companies will be going before the Board of Transport Commissioners and if this amendment is carried they will be under a handicap as compared to other companies who are making application for the same purposes. I think in all fairness that these two companies coming to the parliament of Canada for a charter should be treated equally, and have equal powers when they appear before the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Mr. SMITH: Hear, hear; everybody agrees with that.

Mr. RILEY: Then, if those companies want to enlarge their powers at a later date, they will both be in the same position and will have the right to come before parliament and ask that their powers be enlarged so that they can extend their operations to provinces other than Alberta and British Columbia.

Mr. MAYBANK: Mr. Chairman, I might tell the committee something with reference to the bill to which I made reference this afternoon when Mr. Smith was speaking, and when I think there was a short exchange between us, and when I said there was one bill which only asked power to build in Canada, and he made some answer to me. The committee will recall the incident, I think. Now, in that case I was a little surprised that the person from Winnipeg who had asked me to sponsor their bill drafted their bill in the manner which I described. They desired powers only to build in Canada, and I said: "it is none of my business, I don't care; but, why do you cut it down like that? Every person else seems to ask for wider powers." Well, their answer was: "we are fairly convinced that all we need to do it to come down as far as Winnipeg; if we want any more later, if we prosper and we want more, to go somewhere else.

I suppose they will come forward with an amendment, and that is the way very often with people who are applying for charters. They say: give us such and such a charter, make us that much nearer or that much less near in some cases to what is the position of a natural person, and so long as there is not anything morally objectionable or reprehensible in any way about the request for powers being asked, then I submit that the powers asked for by the persons who come before us should be granted, unless there is some good reason against it; and for that reason I would urge that the bill be not amended at all unless it be for some very definite thing that we discover to be wrong. I would ask that we do not amend the bill at all and particularly not amend it in this respect.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

All those in favour of the amendment signify by answering yes to the call of your name. Those against say no.

Yeas, 11; nays 23.

The motion was negatived.

Shall the section carry?