

ment to take care of that increased demand; and did you not indicate to the committee that the relative proportion would be 6 to 1?—A. I did not say that it would be 6 to 1; I said we expected that it would be something like 25 per cent to 75 per cent.

Mr. MURRAY: You said that Canada would have the preference.

The WITNESS: They would have priority in so far as we can estimate what Canada is going to need. At the moment I doubt if anybody could make an exact estimate of that.

*By Mr. Harkness:*

Q. When you were giving evidence in connection with the population from rural B.C. you stated that the proportion going south from Munroe—and that would include Seattle, Tacoma, Portland and so forth—would be a 20-inch pipe line—that large area to the south would be your chief market, is that correct?—A. Yes.

Q. In Seattle, Tacoma, Portland and so forth?—A. That is the largest market, a good part of it at least, if you include Seattle and Portland together it is the larger market.

Q. Yes, then you say the line going north to Vancouver would be a 22-inch line. Why do you need a larger line going north to Vancouver than going south to Seattle and Portland where you have the largest market?—A. So we will have the pressure to supply Vancouver and other points.

Q. It would seem to me that if you are only going at any time to envisage sending 25 per cent of your gas to the north that you would not need a larger pipe line going north than you have going south where you are going to send 75 per cent of it?—A. We had this worked out by very competent engineers and it is a matter of where you need some pretty high pressures on the way to Vancouver so that you would have enough to feed the gas to inland points.

Q. That is the explanation of that larger line in Canada, because you need higher pressure?—A. We need a lot higher pressure crossing the international boundary to take care of the line going from Vancouver up the Fraser Valley.

Q. Then, to go on to another point. I think you stated that you would serve 37,000 consumers in British Columbia. Now, I take it from that you mean 32,000.—A. No, 32,000 population outside of the city of Vancouver; there would be a population of 32,000. I think I made an error there, I understand that Nelson alone has a population of 30,000 and that is not included.

Q. In other words, you figure that you will serve 32,000 customers in the interior of British Columbia?—A. Yes, at consumer points outside of Vancouver which will be served by that line.

Q. And that does not include the town of Nelson?—A. No, that does not include Nelson.

Q. Then have you any figures as to the number of consumers you expect to have throughout British Columbia including the City of Vancouver?—A. You mean we could need a bigger pipe line?

Q. No, I mean the number of customers that you are likely to have on the line.—A. We had those figures given to us in great detail, and also estimates as to how many there will be additional as time goes on.

Q. The reason I asked the question is this, Mr. Dixon; at a hearing before the Alberta Natural Gas and Petroleum Survey Board the Canadian Western Gas Company presented evidence through their president on that point which to me is very interesting. I come from Calgary, the city of Calgary, and I am pretty interested in this gas matter from the point of view of Calgary.

And in the evidence that he presented he produced figures to show that the number of outlets that they had for that system, which includes Lethbridge and the towns between Calgary and Lethbridge was, in 1949, 38,000 and the total amount of gas which they supplied to those 38,000 outlets with a total population,