

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

befuddle the Canadian public in the hope of making political profit for the next election.

That is from a paper which has not always been friendly to this government. May I also refer you to another article which appeared in the *Financial Post* of June 2, reading as follows:

The Case for Speed is Clear and Urgent

The loud and lengthy row in Ottawa about the gas pipe line is not serving the national interest.

Opposition M.P.'s would like the public to believe that they are a platoon of John Hampdens saving parliament from executive tyranny and defending a Canadian natural resource against foreign exploitation.

What they are really doing is endangering a project that will be greatly to the advantage of the Canadians in the west who want to sell gas and the other Canadians, mainly in the east, who want to buy it.

It is unfortunate that negotiations with Trans-Canada did not mature fast enough to let the government present its plan earlier in the session. To announce closure before the debate began may have been ham-handed.

But the case for speed is clear. Actually the key purpose of the government's proposal was speed—to get the job going this summer.

If action in this construction season were not a matter of concern, the government would not be making its present proposal and Trans-Canada would be left to continue its hunt for loans in the normal places. So a lengthy filibuster which would prevent action this construction season would be just as much a frustration of majority will as defeat of the measure itself.

This is not a Sell-Out

The trouble with the opposition is not that it has been gagged but that it has been unconvincing and unconstructive.

Canadian taxpayers, it is said, are being asked to pay Americans for laying the pipe line. The fact is that the government is merely proposing a loan repayable with interest. And if the pipe line were any such sure-fire profit bonanza as some opposition speakers imply, there would not be five minutes' delay in getting the required loans. Actually, the pipe line itself is at best a very modest profit proposition.

Wildly extravagant and ill-founded statements have been made that this is a vicious sell-out of natural resources to foreigners.

Natural resources are of only hypothetical value until they can be sold. The pipe line will give western Canadians a lot of revenue for something they can't sell now. Their raw material sales will serve the interest of eastern Canadian industries and householders first.

Gas which is surplus to Canadian needs will be sold in the United States.

Do we hear cries of "sell-out to foreigners" when Canada makes gigantic sales of forest products and minerals to Americans, often through United States controlled companies? Of course not.

Let parliament stop this politics-playing, get this matter settled and get ahead on this and other pieces of important national business.

Of course, the C.C.F. want to nationalize the pipe line. I do not blame them for that. They have always been a socialist party, and they would like to nationalize all the means of production. Anybody with any common sense knows that if we can get a natural re-

[Mr. Hunter.]

source from Alberta to eastern Canada without paying for it with taxpayers' money, we would have a hole in our heads if we paid for it out of the taxpayers' money. This line is not a national asset; it is a construction job. If we can get private industry to pay for that construction job—

An hon. Member: If.

Mr. Hunter:—we would be unworthy of our positions here if we spent the taxpayers' money on it. They keep on saying, "We have sold our birthright." The only thing we have sold to the Americans is some surplus gas. What do they want us to do with it? Should we burn it or cap it? It is absurd to say we are selling out to the Americans when we are selling surplus gas to the Americans. The Americans sold us large quantities of oil during the war. They did not cut it off. They let us have it because they are friends of ours.

An hon. Member: You do not live in southwestern Ontario.

Mrs. Fairclough: They did cut it off during the war.

Mr. Hunter: You are a little emotional; keep quiet. Not only that, but this pipe line and the energy that comes from it will in turn provide employment for many thousands of Canadians who would never get that employment if they depended on this handful of misfits over here to my left. I wonder if they suggest that we should send back to the United States American subsidiaries in Canada such as General Motors of Canada, Chrysler Corporation of Canada, Ford of Canada, Canadian General Electric, Westinghouse, Bell Telephone, International Business Machines, National Cash Register, Goodyear, C.I.L., Imperial Oil, International Nickel and Anaconda Brass? Would you send those companies back? They provide thousands and thousands of well-paid jobs to Canadian citizens.

Mr. Rowe: Whose policy brought them here?

Mr. Hunter: This is a very large scheme. In fact it is so large that the people in that part of the house cannot even understand it. The Leader of the Opposition brought up a new slogan the other day. How did it go? "On guard for Canada." I should like to suggest a more apt slogan than that for the Tories: "Obstruction always; construction never."

As far as this marriage of convenience between this so-called Conservative group, the great reactionary group, and the socialists is concerned, it is going to be very interesting to see what the progeny will be. One thing