

Boundary Pipeline Corporation

Mr. Green: On what basis is the case heard in this manner? Apparently all that happened was that counsel for the two parties appeared and made statements, following which the committee reached a decision. Is there no provision for the calling of witnesses by the committee? Surely it is not right to have a case decided merely on statements of counsel.

Mr. Winkler: This was not a court case, so far as we were concerned, unless the committee decided to make it such. The decision of the committee was that it was not necessary to hear witnesses. It made its decision accordingly.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Coldwell: On division.

Bill read the third time and passed on division.

BOUNDARY PIPELINE CORPORATION

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 13, 1952, consideration in committee of Bill No. 62, to incorporate Boundary Pipeline Corporation—Mr. Larson—Mr. Beaudoin in the chair.

On section 1—*Incorporation.*

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, at nine o'clock on Tuesday night I was completing my remarks with respect to the incorporation of this particular company and I should like to continue on that same subject. Being a member of the committee which studied this particular bill I think it is only fair that I mention what took place in the committee. An expert witness, a Mr. Herring of the Fish Engineering Corporation, Houston, Texas, appeared as an expert witness. Looking back on my experience in committees since coming to the house, I think what occurred in this committee was the first indication of an overwhelming government majority endeavouring to apply closure on the proceedings of a committee.

I regretted that very much as a member of this House of Commons. I think it is about time that the rights of members of parliament were recognized. At that particular time we were endeavouring to obtain further evidence from Mr. Herring. The hon. member for Calgary West made what I think was a masterful speech in the House of Commons in which he outlined the common-sense policy that should be followed in the Dominion of Canada

in respect of gas and oil. In the committee the hon. member conducted a very thorough examination of this witness. In this country we are all interested in the proper development of our natural resources. We recognize that a province may have prior rights to any other province in connection with natural resources, but we recognize also that our natural resources are for the good of Canada as a whole. We also feel that if any bill coming before a committee is to have proper scrutiny and study—

Mr. Gibson: Scrutiny.

Mr. Murphy: Thank you. I wish the hon. member had been on that committee as he might have supported the opposition for once. If we had been in a hurry, there might have been some excuse, but there was no other matter to come before the committee. I think this was the fourth session, but whether it was the fourth or the sixth session makes no difference.

I resent vehemently the attitude of the government members on that committee in stifling the production of evidence which was necessary in order to reach a proper conclusion. It simply shows the people of this country what happens when we have a government with too large a majority.

An hon. Member: Rubbish.

Mr. Murphy: I know it is rubbish. When you have too large a majority, it certainly is rubbish.

An hon. Member: You are blushing when you say that.

An hon. Member: You have not said anything yet.

Mr. Murphy: I enjoy these interruptions because I can go on until nine o'clock as long as time is allowed.

An hon. Member: Is that not what you expected to do?

An hon. Member: You have not said anything yet.

Mr. Murphy: If you had ears you could listen.

An hon. Member: You have not said anything.

An hon. Member: If you had brains you could say it.

Mr. Murphy: If you just keep still I will say something in a minute. I realize that the Grit members on the other side will not like what I am going to say. I think it is about time that we of the opposition had our rights recognized in committees and in the House of Commons. We should not be stifled as we were in that committee.