

Q. Into Spokane?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that the only plan that you have filed before the Alberta board?—A. We have plans of five routes.

Q. Have you filed those with the Alberta board?—A. I was not in the Alberta application, but I would assume so.

Q. This is in connection with these places, Crowsnest Pass, Trail, Vancouver, Tacoma, Seattle and Portland and Spokane; you know where Spokane is, don't you?—A. Yes.

Q. And the idea is to take it through Kingsgate and directly to Spokane—I am not mentioning the small places—thence west to a point shortly before reaching Seattle (Bellingham, isn't it?) and then north on a stud line into Vancouver; isn't that what you are speaking about in this application—and south, of course, to Portland, Tacoma and Seattle?—A. Mr. Smith, I did not draft that. But I do say this. In view of what is contained in the undertaking, that when that was drafted, and no doubt when any of the documents are drafted, the people engaged in drafting them on behalf of this company, draft them in such a way that it will be clear that the maximum number of users both in Canada and in the United States, the greatest possible market, will be reached. I do not know that there is anything obscure about that idea as expressed in the memorandum I have read to this committee. Obviously, they want to serve the maximum number of consumers in Canada and the United States if the pipe line is to be a financially feasible project.

Q. The largest market?—A. Quite so, we want to get the widest possible markets. Now, the drafting of these applications in that way I take it is the only feasible way to do it. As I say, we have five routes and we undertake to build on any one of the five that the Board of Transport Commissioners will direct us to build on. I do not think we could go any further. It would be presumptuous for us to say we will build route "A" or "B" between certain points in a certain way to this committee. We would be misleading this committee if we said we are going to go ahead and build route "B" and we find later that the Board of Transport Commissioners would not authorize that certain route. I think in view of the legislation we could do no more before this committee than what we have done, namely engage to undertake to build whatever route the Board might direct. There has been a great deal said in the House of Commons about a Canadian route. We say of the Canadian route, "We have such a route. We have surveyed an all-Canadian route, and we engage to build that if we are so directed by the Board of Transport Commissioners." I do not know what more we can do. I think if you were the solicitor for the company you would do the same thing.

Q. I cannot tell you what I would do were I in that position, because I think my position would be a little bit altered. If I acted for the company I would no doubt do what they told me; but I want to ask you this: is this a fair statement, that you are seeking incorporation of this company to build a pipe line from a point in Alberta—and this sets out that it would be in the neighbourhood of Pincher Creek—and through Vancouver and you do not know, your company does not know where it intends to build that line?—A. I do not think we could possibly know until the Board of Transport Commissioners passes upon it.

Q. So you are going, as you said, before the Board of Transport Commissioners on that?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever been before them in connection with a charter for a railway company?—A. No, I have not.

Q. So your position is that you are going to go before the Board of Transport Commissioners and seek authority to build a gas pipe line and you are not in a position to tell the board where you want to build it?—A. We have five available routes.

Q. Oh, you are going to give them five chances. That is more than most of us ever get. Your position is that you are going to go there and ask them to