

Q. But gas was in use there long before oil was there in any quantity and the development actually, I would submit, has taken place. I am talking about industrial development chiefly, and population growth.—A. In this particular case it would be very hard to determine because other fuels were very cheap in that region and we cannot say what was due to gas. And except for the ammonia plant I do not know of any plant there which was due directly to the gas.

Q. Would you concede that conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan are relatively similar except that in Alberta we have had gas and in Saskatchewan they have not.—A. I do not like to get into a discussion of the similarity of two Canadian provinces.

Q. Well, nevertheless the fact is—

Mr. MURRAY: What about the C.C.F.?

Mr. HARKNESS: We have very much more development in Alberta than there is in Saskatchewan and I think that gas is the answer.

Mr. BYRNE: My understanding of this gathering is that it is to receive information from the witness. I have heard on many occasions the member who is speaking now give his opinions on the pipe lines during the last four or five months in the House of Commons and I must say that I am not in the least interested in his opinions but I am interested in the opinions of the witness.

Mr. HARKNESS: The witness has made a certain statement and I think I have a perfect right to question him on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask, however, that the discussion be confined a little more to the subject of the bill and not to too many detours.

Mr. HARKNESS: This is an important statement and one on which some question and comment is required.

*By Mr. Harkness:*

Q. How, to look at a different phase of the matter, would you consider that the building of a gas pipe line through the area in which there was either very little or no oil and gas development, where no wells had been drilled, would promote the development of that drilling?—A. I know of a great many long lines running from Texas all the way to Los Angeles. One line has been there for some time now. I know of the Panhandle Line, and I know of the Northern Natural line to Minneapolis and other lines. They start at the gas fields, and the territories along those routes as far as I know, have never been developed because of those pipe lines.

Q. I think you are getting around the question a little?

The CHAIRMAN: I think he has been very good. He has answered the questions at far too great length and given you far too much for your money.

*By Mr. Harkness:*

Q. Let us put it in a more definite form. If the gas line were going through the northern part of Alberta and British Columbia where there is a certain amount of oil and gas development now, in your opinion would the existence of that pipe line promote further drilling?—A. If there was a line there, the existence of the gas pipe line would promote drilling for gas, yes.

Q. That is all I want. That is fine. Now, in your statement of this morning or yesterday, I have forgotten which, you said that you were planning on delivering 11 billion cubic feet to British Columbia and 62 billion cubic feet to the United States?—A. I do not think that is quite right.

Q. Then what was it?—A. It was 11,500,000,000, if the consolidated took the small estimate; but if they took the large estimate, it would be 2 million more than that.

Q. But on the basis of the smaller estimate, just approximately—I do not care for a few hundred thousands—but just approximately, it would be 11 billion