

Canada. I do not mean with respect to fishing by international companies in the three mile limit or anything of that sort, but, here we are, dealing with gas. Why should we have these provisions for outside Canada?

Perhaps I should ask all of the questions and then you can answer them at once.

That power gives them also power with respect to lines outside of Canada and their other business transactions, shall we say, over which in my judgment, and as far as I can see, we have no authority whatever. We have an authority over here in the corner, however, and probably he will want to be heard with respect to that.

Then this bill goes on and deals with aircraft—that they may lease or sell or maintain and operate aircraft and aerodromes for the purpose of this undertaking, together with the facilities required for the operation of such aircraft and aerodromes. Now I want to ask Mr. Connolly if he has gone into the question of the rights of air transport companies, and if he is satisfied with his clauses as they are here? And whether he is satisfied that he is not in breach with a policy which has to do with government ownership of air transport in this country?

I am not for a moment saying that you are in breach of this but I am asking you if you have examined it and if you are content with it? Perhaps you yourself may need a little amendment here in connection with your Act.

The next thing I want to ask about is the part—"to own, lease, operate and maintain interstation telephone, teletype and telegraph communication systems and subject to The Radio Act, 1938, and any other statute relating to radio, own, lease, operate and maintain interstation communication facilities;"

The reason I ask you about the last two or three lines is that I have had some experience with corporations in Alberta endeavouring to get radio communication from head office, we will say in Calgary, to the various stations where they have those portable units which are carried around where the drilling crew is working. They may be working a long way from necessary facilities and radio is needed for quick action, in case of accident, fires and so on. I just wonder if it is sufficient—if you are satisfied from the inquiries you have made—that your statute here in these three particulars is in accordance with the existing law?

Perhaps I should say that I am formally seconding Mr. Green's amendment.

Mr. HODGSON: I have several questions which I would like to ask.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Connolly might first answer those questions.

Mr. CONNOLLY: As to whether or not the words "outside of Canada" should be there I may say first, when this bill and other bills were originally drafted it was generally agreed that the provision should be there. There is a provision in the general Pipe Lines Act, section 9, which provides that a company operating a company pipe line from a place in Canada to a place on the international boundary line may exercise, beyond such boundary, in so far as permitted by laws there in force, the powers that it may exercise in Canada.

That is one reason why the words were included.

Mr. SMITH: That does not mean anything in court?

Mr. CONNOLLY: It is in the law, Mr. Smith—it is section 9, and we have to deal with it as we find it.

Mr. SMITH: I agree with you that it is surplusage.

Mr. CONNOLLY: Point two is that this company would not require a dominion charter if it were building solely within the limits of one province; but the dominion asserts jurisdiction when it crosses provincial or international boundaries. I think that is perhaps the main reason for that clause.