

the days of John Wilkes in the mid-eighteenth century. It is, therefore, interesting to read that in 1621 parliament, then dominated by the sovereign, not by the sovereign's chief minister, asked that something be done to restore freedom to parliament, and that at that time this was said:

... in the handling ... of those businesses every member of the house hath, and of right ought to have, freedom of speech to propound, treat, reason, and bring to conclusion the same.

An hon. Member: "Bring to a conclusion".

Mr. Diefenbaker: In 1956 the Prime Minister was afraid of parliament. He was afraid of discussion. He was fearful that if certain questions were asked the government would find itself in a difficult, if not impossible, position. What did James I do? Well, James I dealt with the situation very quickly. He answered the protestation. He sent for the journals of the house and with his own hand tore out the pages containing the protest. The Prime Minister did not do that. He only made it impossible for the journals to contain freedom of speech during the days that it was denied in this house. Yes, the last two weeks have been sorry days.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: What an orator.

Mr. Diefenbaker: My hon. friends laugh—sorry days for the Canadian parliament, sorry days when a majority adopts "brutalitarian" tactics in order to deny this parliament freedom of speech.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, yes, they realize it is true. They have deprived us of our rights under the specious claim that there is a fixed date, June 7, a day beyond which men in Canada may not go in discussion, the zero hour, the end of all things. Mr. Chairman, it is ridiculous. I do not wonder that my hon. friends laugh. When they say to parliament that we have until June 7 and beyond that date there will be no more freedom of speech on this matter, who set the date? What have you been doing for five long years? Playing around with this corporation, with these adventurers from Texas and New York trading away Canada's natural resources at the expense of the Canadian people. No, we have not learned the answer yet as to why the government is so solicitous with respect to this company whose only capital is a few million dollars and, of course, all the power of the cabinet and those associated with them to force this matter through the House of Commons.

Is it for the benefit of the Canadian people? Is it to benefit the Canadian producer and

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

consumer? I asked the Prime Minister a simple question yesterday, as to how the federal power commission is getting along; because after all, we will have a pipe line from Winnipeg onward provided the federal power commission of the United States allows us to have it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke of the pipe line being under the laws of Canada. Yes, the statute, the incorporation, is under the laws of Canada, but the actions of this corporation are dependent on a corporate body under the United States government. I asked the Prime Minister how are things going over there, have you an observer, and the answer was that there was no information.

What are they doing over there? For the past three months they have been discussing the matter. They have 200 pounds of documents, and there are 118 lawyers discussing it. There are 112 different dissenting interests. Sometimes I think before they are through they will give us an idea as to the meaning of eternity. Yes, on and on they go; and we in Canada are to have a pipe line from Winnipeg onward to meet the demands of eastern Canada if the federal power commission in its wisdom, decides—its decision then being subject to appeal to the supreme court of the United States—that gas shall be imported into the United States.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said last night that one of the reasons we are in this position where time is so much of the essence is the tightness of money, that recently the supply of money has become tight. Sir, money may have become tight, but money is still available for sound projects even though the interest rate may be a little higher. If Trans-Canada were a good risk it would not have to go begging all over Canada and the United States to get money and finally end by asking for a guarantee of the people of Canada. It is not that money is tight, but the fact that this company has nothing but the adventuresome spirit as capital in coming before the Canadian people and endeavouring to put over this proposition.

Is it beneficial to the people of Canada? Well, the place to go and find these things is in the records of the federal power commission. I have the record here showing the prices that are to be paid.

What are the prices that are to be paid by these American companies, including Mid-Western Pipe Line Company, the infant of the Tennessee corporation that is headed by Gardiner Symonds, who also happens to be a member of the executive of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines? They are going to see to it that the Canadian gas consumers will be obliged to pay unusually high retail prices