

Boundary Pipeline Corporation

Mr. Gibson: You cannot sink a battleship that way.

Mr. Murphy: I enjoy these interruptions, but I hope you are watching the clock, Mr. Chairman. I know the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is just back from a fishing trip which he seems to have enjoyed. We had not finished the examination of Mr. Herring when one of the huge government majority on that committee moved a motion to stop further discussion. As a matter of fact the questions were beginning to get very embarrassing. It seemed to me and to others in the opposition that no matter what bill was proposed by a Liberal member it was going to pass the committee no matter what we said.

An hon. Member: More rubbish.

Mr. Murphy: In the middle of this examination a motion was moved by the hon. member for Iles-de-la-Madeleine, and I quote from page 73 of the proceedings of the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines as follows:

Mr. Cannon moved that sufficient evidence has been obtained for the committee to decide as to the economic practicability of the pipeline under consideration; and that the question be put on the preamble without further examination of the witness. After discussion and the question having been put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

I might say that there was one good Liberal who voted in opposition to that particular motion.

An hon. Member: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Gibson: You will never be a senator.

Mr. Murphy: Not likely, and a lot of you people are going to have faint hopes after the next election. I would have been in agreement if the motion had been worded a little differently. It might have been possible that even those without political motives would have been agreeable to granting a charter to this particular company in spite of what the hon. member for Bow River said the other night that he hoped a number of companies would be incorporated in order that the province of Alberta could bargain. I would have been satisfied to move a motion that we had heard plenty of evidence after the hon. member for Calgary West read the letter that afternoon which he received from the manager of the Winnipeg Electric Company, and to that I wish to refer.

An hon. Member: Why didn't you move it?

Mr. Murphy: With respect to the motion to cease hearing any more evidence I wish to go on record as having taken exception at

[Mr. Murphy.]

that time, and I said, as found on page 91 of the proceedings of the committee:

I would like to say a word before you put that motion. In the first place, I dislike very much this railroading which is apparent—

Continuing later I said:

I know there has been a lot of examination. There is going to be more; at least, I hope there is going to be more because I come from Ontario and I am very much interested in getting Alberta gas, and I think the members from Quebec are very much interested in getting Alberta gas. I think it would be very unfair to us in Ontario or Quebec to have any stifling of evidence, because we are not in a hurry.

Certainly there was a stifling of evidence when that motion was put before the committee.

This is not a matter of minor detail. It is a matter of the development of natural resources of Alberta, and I hope of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and other provinces also; and it opens up a very large field. I am quite sure that the members of the committee would be reasonable enough to have some patience because this examination is too important to cut off in such a peremptory manner; and that evidence produced this morning may not be to the liking of some members of the committee. Mind you, I am of the opinion that when the picture has developed later it will have a great bearing on what we are going to do. What we are doing today will have a great bearing on what is going to happen later on, and I for one want more information; and I think that what Mr. Nickle was endeavouring to establish was that there is contradictory evidence which I think, in the interests of every member of the committee, should be put on the record. If Mr. Nickle has evidence which does not substantiate that given by the witness we, as a jury, have to consider that evidence. Mr. Nickle now has reports from other reputable engineering firms contradictory to what has been given by the witness; and, with all due respect, I think he is a marvellous witness . . . But there are these figures Mr. Nickle desires to submit which have been prepared by responsible engineering firms, and I think that he should be entitled to put them on record in answer to the evidence given by this witness, even if he has to go on the stand and put it in himself.

Mr. Laing: When are you going to say something?

Mr. Murphy: Because of that particular examination having been delayed somewhat and the hour of one o'clock having been reached we adjourned. At the opening of the afternoon meeting of the same committee Mr. Nickle had a letter which he had obtained from the manager of the Winnipeg Electric Company.

* **Mr. Laing:** Promise to say something.

Mr. Murphy: Oh, I have not heard you say anything yet so just keep still.

An hon. Member: What has electricity got to do with gas?

Mr. Murphy: I am going to quote Mr. Nickle's statement to be found at page 101 of