

Mr. APPLEWHAITE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear to Mr. Higgins and to the members of the committee that when I challenged the correctness of the things being stated by the witness I was not suggesting that Mr. Higgins was producing something which was not an exactly correct transcript.

Mr. HIGGINS: But the suggestion was conveyed when I was asked what was at the bottom of the transcript.

Mr. CARROLL: I want to find out whether or not it is the intention, Mr. Chairman, to put this evidence in the record of this committee? If so, I object to the whole proceedings. It cannot be evidence before this committee.

Mr. HIGGINS: I am not asking that it be put in. I merely brought it up to clear my own reputation in that particular matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you have cleared yourself, and if you are not particular about it going in, we can leave it out. Now, Mr. Harkness has the floors.

*By Mr. Harkness:*

Q. Mr. Dixon I think you have mentioned several times that the construction of a pipe line does not cause development, by which I understand you to mean population development or industrial development. Are you familiar with the development which has taken place in the province of Alberta during the last 30 years?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you say that any part of that development has been due to the construction of a natural gas line in that province?—A. There are no big natural gas transmission lines in the province of Alberta.

Q. Well, Mr. Dixon, you know that there is a transmission line from the southern part of the province up to Calgary with which another line from the Turner Valley ties in, and there is a transmission line from the gas field which is east of Edmonton into Edmonton and which runs down to Red Deer; and while those are not extremely long pipe lines, nevertheless they are several hundred miles in all, and I would like to ask you whether you consider that the construction of those pipe lines had anything to do with the development which took place in Alberta.—A. Yes, but I know of no development which took place along the lines of your Kinsella field to Edmonton due to that gas line, nor do I know of any development which took place along the line to Calgary due to the laying of that line, that is to say, along the line. That is what I was saying.

Q. Have you ever heard of the city of Lethbridge?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you admit that a considerable amount of industrial development has taken place there as the result of gas coming from—A. That is not due to the laying of a transmission line. It was brought about in Lethbridge due to the enterprise of the people there utilizing the gas.

Q. My suggestion, Mr. Dixon, is that we have an amount of development in Alberta which has been due to a very considerable extent to the construction of the gas lines which we have there.—A. Development in Calgary and Edmonton has certainly been added to by those pipe lines.

Q. And Lethbridge?—A. And Lethbridge.

Q. And Medicine Hat?—A. But those towns, all of those towns with the exception of Edmonton have gas very close to them.

Q. But Calgary certainly did not have gas close to it, until comparatively recent times. Our gas there all came from the southern area east of Lethbridge.—A. That was in very small volume.

Q. Until the Turner Valley was brought in. In any event, the point I wanted to bring to your attention was this fact that in my opinion at least, and I think in your own judging from what you have said now, a good deal of the development that has taken place in Alberta has been due to the fact that gas has been available.—A. Well, you can look at it in this way: that a great deal of the development in Alberta is due to oil and gas.