

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

at issue. The necessity for this present resolution stems from just such elements in the months prior to the 1953 Canadian general election. The disregard of economic factors then has, to some extent, carried on to the present. Efforts to make political hay now for the 1957 general election by similar strayings from the realm of fact into emotionalism might win some votes, but at the expense of lasting damage to Canada's future.

I deeply regret that I am at variance with my Conservative colleagues in this house on the issue now before us, for I firmly believe in the basic principles of the Conservative party, and believe also that, for Canada's sake, it is logical and essential that the Conservatives rather than some other party should succeed the Liberals as the government of our country. But where the application of political expediency is contrary to what I honestly believe are Canada's best interests, I have no alternative but to disagree.

Later in my remarks I will deal specifically with various points raised in this house and in the press, criticizing this particular resolution and the Trans-Canada company. I hope these facts in rebuttal will be of some value to this house in its deliberations.

I mentioned earlier that there are possible alternatives to this present pipe line plan. Regretfully, I can no longer include among prospective alternatives the policy of soundest economic planning of pipe line routes and markets, of which I have been an advocate for several years. That must be ruled out as an alternative—at least now—because neither the major advocates nor the major opponents of the proposals now before us are willing to back away from their commitment to the costly and uneconomic northern Ontario pipe line route as a prime requisite of the first pipe line east from Alberta. I am confident that we would not now be debating this resolution had it not been for that requirement, for a major gas pipe line reaching into eastern Canada by a more economic route would have already been financed by free enterprise, and would have been either in the final stages of construction or fully in operation.

Who is to blame for this situation? In part, blame must be assessed on the Clint Murchison interests of Texas, original proposers of the trans-Canada pipe line, for coming forward with a proposition based on meagre engineering and economic studies, one dependent for "financeability" on a tight squeeze at both ends of the pipe line—low prices to producers, high costs to consumers—and a greater willingness than normal on the part of insurance companies and other investors to put up about \$275 million without real

assurance of any normal return. I might point out that the present Trans-Canada company is a far different proposition than it was in the days that Murchison was the sole owner. Murchison and his interests have now been reduced to a minor interest and will become a much more minor interest after public financing when they will be replaced in large degree by a large measure, I hope, of Canadian public investment.

But, Mr. Chairman, even greater blame for the present situation lies upon those in politics—and they come from Liberal, Conservative and socialist parties—who quickly leaped without looking upon an "all-Canadian gas pipe line policy" bandwagon in the preliminaries to the 1953 general election. You may recall that it was in March, 1953 that I first took public issue with my party and the government and pointed out that a gas pipe line from Alberta to eastern Canada confined to a Canadian route and to Canadian markets was not economically feasible, and urged a careful reappraisal of that and more economic alternative plans. The request was disregarded.

During the 1953 election Liberals and Tories rather solidly committed themselves to and sold the Canadian public on the "all-Canadian route and market" idea, in some of their statements going well beyond even what the agents for Murchison were willing to commit themselves to. So did the socialists but they, unlike the two major parties who favoured private ownership, plumped for a socialized project with all the evils that I am confident a socialized project would involve.

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Chairman, I submit that the hon. member is reading every word of his speech from a prepared statement.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Ellis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I submit that the hon. member is reading every word from a prepared statement, contrary to the rules of the house.

The Deputy Chairman: I think it is fairly well known in this committee and in this house at the present time that so far chairmen and Speakers have found it impossible to enforce any rule against the reading of speeches.

Mr. Knowles: But there is such a rule, is there not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Nickle: Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am following extensive notes. I would far rather follow notes for the short time left to me and deal with this subject in detailed form than talk blindly without them.