

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

some stage. There is the Gairdner proposal. That ought to be given very serious consideration. There may be others available if the government would stop making a political football of this.

We well know the way in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has for a long time now wielded his big stick over business, terrorizing business. If you wonder why more offers have not been forthcoming, you will find the reason in the big stick of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

They have money aplenty to hand over to the assistance of United States investors but they have not money for Canadian municipalities. They have not what is needed to help Canadian municipalities—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Fleming:—in the matter of housing and other essential services. Interest rates are going up, and many municipalities are going to find it infinitely more difficult than in the past to finance their essential services. Yet the government can find ample money to assist these United States investors. They are not Canadian philanthropists.

Who is the author of this infamous proposal? I say to you it is the same minister with the same mentality who sought a year ago an extension of absolute power at the hands of the house; who remains unrepentant over his own lust for power; who is indifferent to the fact that we are buying from the United States nearly \$1 billion worth of goods every year more than we sell to that country; who will not lift a finger in the face of the growing concentration of Canadian trade in the American basket, who views with equanimity and indifference the growing United States economic influence over Canada, who demands of his followers that they toe the party line, who is up to his ears in unsold wheat, who has made such a monstrous botch of the marketing of wheat and now would make a botch of the marketing of natural gas in Canada, who wants to play fast and loose with a great national heritage, who will not have a committee because he does not think it is good for members of parliament, including his own followers, to know very much about the facts because they are only troublesome and unnecessary people, to whom communications are not communications and whose statements indicate, as I do not need to remind hon. members who have sat in the house this session, let alone memory going farther back, that he does not know so often what he is talking about.

So, sir, we see events reaching their inevitable climax. Here is the toeing of the party line. It is this same minister who said, "If we

wanted to get away with it, who would stop us?" Now we will see the full fruits of that kind of attitude, that kind of mentality, on the part of a despotic minister.

But it is not only the Minister of Trade and Commerce, for others share the responsibility with him and principally the Prime Minister who sits silent in this house in the face of a major issue, who voted for closure today, who has retired in all but name, who is not doing his duty in this house in sitting silent and allowing measures like this to be perpetrated upon the Canadian parliament, who is hiding behind a reckless Minister of Trade and Commerce. Behold the wantonness of power!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fleming: The Minister of Trade and Commerce concluded his words on May 8 with this sentence:

The action proposed today is another declaration of independence by Canada . . .

That is an interesting expression. There never was a declaration of independence in the history of Canada, but there was a declaration of independence in the history of the United States. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is confused, you see, as to what country he is supposed to be serving. What the Minister of Trade and Commerce really meant to say was: "The action proposed today is another American declaration of independence with Canadian assistance."

So I say to you, sir, in conclusion—would that I had more time!—that it is the duty of free men in a free Canadian parliament to assert Canada's independence of United States economic domination. That right was won for Canada by Sir John A. Macdonald in the construction of the C.P.R. as a Canadian enterprise.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fleming: It was won for Canada in the national policy of 1878. It was preserved by Sir Robert Borden in 1911, and if there is any—

An hon. Member: What about 1930?

Mr. Fleming:—respect for freedom in this country, Mr. Chairman, that right of Canada to preserve her economic independence will be maintained and assured to her not by the worn-out government opposite that has forgotten all sense of responsibility, but by those who value and understand the meaning of freedom and are prepared to struggle in this House of Commons to preserve freedom and to resist every arbitrary measure