

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Carrick:** May I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, what is the situation in connection with this debate? We calculate that 20 or 21 days could have been devoted to this issue. Will the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre deny that in the rules last year we adopted a form of closure when we assigned 10 days to the important speech from the throne debate? Ten days are all that are considered necessary for that. Will he deny that last year we adopted a closure vote of eight days on the budget debate? Eight days are considered sufficient for that. Can my friends sitting over there seriously try to tell us that 21 days are not enough to debate an important issue of this kind?

Many things happened in this house that I wish the public could have seen, because I am a great believer in giving the public the facts and I feel that when the public know the facts they will arrive at the right decision. I wish they could have seen what happened when hon. gentlemen opposite imposed a vote upon this house. Remember, on every occasion the whip would walk out and would take not five minutes or three minutes, but 10 minutes, the maximum time, every time.

**An hon. Member:** Seventeen minutes.

**Mr. Carrick:** Ten minutes to call in the members and 17 minutes, 18 minutes and 20 minutes every time the vote was taken, and all that time we were here waiting for the members to be brought in. The public should know that in this House of Commons the practice is that when all the members are in the house and a vote is taken, and very frequently another vote has to be taken, the Speaker says: "Shall we consider that the members are in the house?" What do they say? Generally, they say "Yes", but in this debate what did they say?

**Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain):** Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Some hon. Members:** Sit down.

**Mr. Nowlan:** There is closure; you cannot ask questions.

**Mr. Carrick:** What is the question? We have had nothing but dilatory proceedings. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if the public of Canada could have been watching what the Conservatives and C.C.F. opposition were doing in this house they would have been ashamed of them.

**An hon. Member:** You had 21 days.

**Mr. Carrick:** You asked me what the opposition should have done? I shall tell you what they should have done. They should have recognized that the majority in this house have the right to rule this house, and closure is a—

67509—293½

**Mr. Carrick:** They shake their heads. The other night the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George quoted Magna Carta and section 49 of the British North America Act, which says that our constitution is founded upon the rule of the majority in this house. It is fundamental that the majority have the right to vote, and indeed the majority rule within the meaning of the constitution. We have closure today, and they should have recognized it. What they should have done is this. They should have recognized the right of the government to apply closure, and that they were going to have every opportunity to debate the merits of the pipe-line loan within the closure limits. Surely that is not an unreasonable request to make of hon. gentlemen opposite if they desired to debate the bill. When they were given that opportunity why did they not take it, instead of wasting time?

**An hon. Member:** Talk about the pipe line.

**Mr. Carrick:** Yes, I will tell you something about the pipe-line right now. I am going to tell you the reason you do not want to debate the pipe-line issue, and that you know you are in a hopeless position.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Speak to the Chair.

**Mr. Carrick:** I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Knowles:** Are you in a hopeless position, Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Carrick:** I will tell you why the Leader of the Opposition gave up on this pipe-line issue. A while ago the treasurer of Ontario came out and said that time was of the essence, the pipe line had to be built. At that time the premier of Ontario, the Conservative leader in Ontario, came out and said the pipe line had to be built.

Where did that leave the Leader of the Opposition in this house? He had hoped to have an election issue. As a result of what happened he knew that he had nothing on the pipe line; he knew that his position was hopeless. He is a very astute gentleman. He has been in politics a long time. If he cannot get where he wants to get in one way he can make a turn and get there another way, and there is no one quite so fast on footwork in the ring as the Leader of the Opposition.

What happened? Extravagant claims were built up. The supremacy of parliament was suppressed. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan spoke of abomination, outrage, and all that kind of political claptrap that they have tried on the people of the country in