

Q. You know something of the natural resources of British Columbia? What is your opinion of the effect of the pipe line going through?—A. As far as British Columbia is concerned, I can see no difference in the effect on British Columbia or to any marked extent as far as communities are concerned between any of the five routes that we have been working on because it does take in Trail and the environs there where gas is immediately useful. The only difference would be the possibility that gas would not get up the Okanagan Valley for a long time from a pipe line coming through the United States. But it is difficult for me to think of any industries that would be developed along the route from Trail going towards the west. There does not seem to be very much there. There are very small towns there. It is uninhabited country, very mountainous and not much timber on it until you get over towards the Cascade range.

Q. You are thinking in terms, I take it, of the communities that already exist?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you taking into consideration the possibility of future development by reason of the fact that your gas line goes through that country?—A. I cannot see what development in that region the pipe line would help unless some one wanted to start a pulp mill there and it would look more reasonable to start a pulp mill nearer better transportation as that country is very difficult in all transportation facilities.

Q. There is another line I would like to follow. It was noted in a previous question that you have applied for the right to build either a gas pipe line, or an oil pipe line, and you told us that it would probably require a year to convert a gas pipe line into an oil pipe line. Do you see any possibility of your company having to do that?—A. Excepting in war, the only possibility would be a great emergency in wartime. That was done in a line that I happened to be connected with, an old line that started at Corpus Christi and came to Houston, that was converted to an oil line during the war and reconverted to a gas line after the war. That is the only case I know of where a gas line has been converted to an oil line, although it is fairly frequent for an oil line to be converted to a gas line.

Q. You are not figuring converting your gas line to oil for commercial purposes?—A. No, a line this size, to be worked economically, would require somewhere from 250,000 to 300,000 barrels going through it every day. Which is, so far as the available supplies in Alberta are concerned, would be entirely too large for such an enterprise.

Q. Mr. Dixon, some of us have been charged with supporting a monopoly concern because we showed some opposition to incorporation. I think you have already admitted that there is no immediate possibility of more than one pipe line being built to the coast.—A. That is for the immediate present. I have had a lot of experience on lines that look like there was only one pipe line that could be possibly be built where there are now a whole series of lines, so I hate to be a prophet on that.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: So you would not care to state how many years from now the second line would be necessary?—A. Well, in the case of one line in Tennessee a great many people argued that it should not be built because there was more gas being supplied than could be used, but then, six months after that line was finished they were building a parallel line alongside it—so it is very difficult to say. One reason, I think really the chief reason, that two lines cannot be built is the fact that Alberta would not allow it. They would think it was taking too much gas from them at the present time.

Q. Can you enlighten us at the present time as to what gain it would be for the Alberta government or for the Board of Transport Commissioners if they have two or three or five or six companies incorporated when only one was