

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

April 27, 1950.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines met this day at 11.00 a.m. The Chairman, Mr. L. O. Breithaupt, presided.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. We will proceed with further consideration of bill No. 7. Mr. Dixon has had sketch maps prepared showing the various routes. These will be distributed. If it meets with your approval we will proceed where we left off last evening.

### Mr. A. F Dixon called:

The WITNESS: I will file these charts, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRUDHAM: Is it your intention to continue hearing evidence as to routes?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is the wish of the committee, because a good deal of time has been taken up on the subject already.

Mr. PRUDHAM: I would then like to move that the Chairman be empowered to call additional witnesses to give evidence as to route.

Mr. GOODE: I second that motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion on that question? If not, are you agreed?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not know about that, but I am sure there would be only one question that I would be interested in and that is the question of route; not that I know anything about this thing at all, but the question put to Mr. Connolly yesterday was as to whether or not when they go before the Board of Transport Commissioners they are going to indicate to the Board that they have a preference as to routes? I do not know but I do not think that this committee, as a committee, has much to do with routes at the present time. I do not know that there is any recommendation that we can make to the Board of Transport Commissioners or any amendment we can make to the Act. However, I am in the hands of the committee who know more about it than I do.

Mr. MAYBANK: Mr. Chairman, I think that if we bring in any more witnesses with reference to routes we will only waste more time and I do not think that the route question is germane to this bill.

Mr. LENNARD: What do you mean, waste time?

Mr. MAYBANK: Just what I said. I was asked a moment ago to raise my voice and I did that, and the words I used are small and plain, I hope. The whole aim here, on the part of some filibusterers, is to establish a monopoly of a particular company.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I must object to that. That is a remark which should be withdrawn. That is a direct insult and meant to be so. It is not the truth and I must ask that it be withdrawn. I would ask for a ruling. I object to the sponsor of this bill getting up and making a very inaccurate statement and I ask that that remark be withdrawn.