

Alberta Natural Gas Company

because it has been indicated by previous speakers that they did not consider that he had given much thought to anything that he had prepared, and that most of his figures had been refuted in some way.

I think the big mistake regarding this whole question, particularly this evening, was that the committee did not sit for the purpose of determining a route for the proposed gas pipe line. The purpose of the committee was to determine the qualifications of the company under the Pipe Lines Act, and thereby grant a charter similar to the charter that has been granted to the West-coast Transmission Company.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra indicated that it was improper for other people who were not members of the committee to be interested in the procedure.

Mr. Green: No. On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I said that it was improper for the sponsor of the bill to be a member of the committee.

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra also brought in the question of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre being interested in what was taking place.

Mr. Green: He certainly was.

Mr. Byrne: I also noted a great deal of interest taken in the proceedings by other people. I noticed that the hon. member for Fraser Valley, the sponsor of the bill that was passed last April granting a charter to the Westcoast Transmission Company, was very active in the committee room. He seemed to take a great deal of interest in the procedure, and no doubt helped in some measure in the opposition that was being carried on.

It has been indicated that in the committee we did not take sufficient time to hear all of the witnesses. Upon entering that committee the first thing I noticed was that there seemed to be a determined effort to waste time. On two occasions I rose to point out the fact that time was being wasted.

Mr. Connolly, who was solicitor for the company, on presenting his case, read a brief that he had prepared. Upon finishing the brief he indicated that the man who would have the facts—I may be unwise even to consider anything a pipe line company had as facts—was Mr. Dixon, who would be able to put us straight on almost every question that would arise. Well, it was insisted that Mr. Connolly take the stand, and he was held on the stand for some two hours, and almost every other question that was put to him was a technical question, and he could not answer them. Mr. Dixon, who sat alongside him with all the information at his fingertips, was denied the right

to answer at that time. I say that that was a definite attempt to waste considerable time, and it was done.

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): You had control of the committee. Why didn't you fix it as you fixed everything else?

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member said that we had control of the committee. I was new on parliamentary committees, but not new on all committees. I have had some experience, and I have seen many attempts made at committee meetings to dominate the committee. I saw early that that was what was going to be done by those opposing the bill. There was a motion moved that this committee follow the usual procedure of other committees and revert to twelve members. There was considerable objection to that, and when it was voted down I heard someone to my left say: "Well, we won the first round." I could see from that there were definite attempts being made to take sides in the whole affair.

It has been indicated by the pipe lines bill and by everyone in the house that this matter of routes does not come under the bill; that we could not write into those bills what the route should be; that that would be for the board of transport commissioners to decide. The board of transport commissioners are civil servants who are paid in the neighbourhood of \$10,000 a year to look after the best interests of the Canadian people. I, as a member of a democratic government and country, have absolute faith in the civil servants who are paid to look after our interests, and I do not intend even to indicate that I would take the word of a director of any pipe line company, or of any other company, as a declaration that they will look after the best interests of the Canadian people. But that is not their function. Their function is to look after the best interests of their shareholders, and that is what they are paid to do.

I personally feel that the board of transport commissioners are the ones who will determine. If it is not possible for us to get sufficient data on it so that we can say categorically that a line must go in any one particular direction, we cannot take the place of those people who are paid to know those things and who study them completely.

It has been said in the debate that the Yellowhead route is the one to follow, and that anyone who votes for these companies which are now applying for a charter is voting against the Yellowhead route. That is not so. Mr. Dixon, who gave evidence, is I understand the president of the company. He said that he would build a pipe line where the board of transport commissioners,