

Mr. GREEN: I would point out that ordinarily committees do not meet on Wednesday morning because of caucuses. We had a caucus this morning but in spite of that a meeting was agreed upon. I would not think, however, that it would be fair to ask us to sit again.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, there was a motion that we adjourn until 4 o'clock this afternoon. I shall put the motion.

Motion carried.

—The committee adjourned to meet this afternoon, Wednesday, April 26, 1950, at 4.00 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

APRIL 26, 1950

—The committee resumed at 4.00 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum and we might as well start where we left off.

Mr. PRUDHAM: Before we proceed, Mr. Chairman, is it your ruling that the committee will continue to hear evidence as to routes and the feasibility of various routes?

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear the opinion of committee members on that point because I am guided by their wishes.

Mr. PRUDHAM: Well, just assuming that it is permitted or established that such will be done, I would like to know if it is permissible for members of this committee to call expert evidence on other routes that are not covered by this company's proposal?

Mr. APPLEWHAITE: I think we all agree that the purpose of this committee is to ascertain sufficient facts to reach an opinion in our minds as to whether it is in the national interest for us to give a charter to a company such as is applying here. It is therefore naturally necessary that we know something of the company's plans, and, at the same time, with the set-up as we have it today with the Board of Transport Commissioners still to come, it is not common sense for us to go into the detail as to which side of a mountain we will go or as to how to get across a lake or something of that nature. In so far as the evidence is concerned it must surely be restricted to generalities. We know that the question in the back of everyone's mind is whether or not the route is going to be in Canada. I think that is the main point and, what the company intends to do along those lines I submit is desirable evidence. However, for the sake of clarity, let us keep away from unnecessary detail into which it is not essential that we examine in any event.

Mr. McIVOR: Mr. Chairman, I have not much to say but I have read this brief and I have listened to the very able questions asked and the exposition given, but it seems to me that it all amounts to after Alberta, British Columbia and Canada being served with gas, if the company is not allowed to sell to the United States there will be no pipe line. Is that right or is it not?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. McIVOR: That is the question on which the whole thing hinges—after Canada is served completely—and I think that Canada should be served first.

Mr. DECORE: I have a question or two to ask of Mr. Connolly at this time.