

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

Mr. Dupuis: Nobody knows what their responsibilities are in the National Union cabinet. At one time, they are here and, at another time, they are there. At all events, he is close to the premier of the province, he is his right hand man, he gives him advice, most of the time, when a decision has to be taken. I am being reminded that Mr. Asselin is a member of the legislative council. It may be that the hon. member for Quebec West never forgets anything, but I do admit that I am not infallible, and I correct the mistakes I make.

Therefore, Mr. Asselin—

(Text):

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Dupuis: Am I through?

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. gentleman's time has not expired, but even though this debate has been extraordinarily general, if I may say so, the pipe line seems to have extended from Vancouver island to the far end of Newfoundland and I do believe that the hon. member who now has the floor is discussing matters which it would be extremely difficult to connect not only with clause 4 but with Trans-Canada Pipe Lines or Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation. I would ask the hon. member in the time which he has left to come back just a little closer to the bill.

Mr. Dupuis: I am sorry, and I really mean it, that you do not understand French. Hon. members on the other side have said that this is being done with all United States capital and by all United States interests. I am simply trying to prove that Edouard Asselin, who is the right-hand man of Hon. Maurice Duplessis, premier of the province of Quebec, is one of the directors of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines. He is not an American, he is a Canadian. That is all I was trying to prove.

Mr. Dufresne: Oh, oh.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Chairman, are you taking account of all this nonsense that is being said and allowing me time?

(Translation):

So, Mr. Chairman, we do not fear going to the people on this matter. However I am wondering, as was the other day a Social Credit member from Alberta, what our Progressive Conservative friends would do if the right hon. Prime Minister decided to call an election. They would surely be very downhearted and in despair; they would become so pale as to look quite like white sepulchres, as they are.

[Mr. Dufresne.]

Mr. Dufresne: We would come to power faster than is expected.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Chairman, I speak loud, but I keep calm and I am in a particularly good humour. We must, as I say, revert to logic.

Mr. Dufresne: True you had wandered far from it.

Mr. Dupuis: Are the opposition members sincere? Are they? Do they or do they not wish merely to have time to discuss this matter? Then, as pointed out a while ago by the leader of the Social Credit party, here is excellent opportunity to prove it. In a democratic gesture the Prime Minister tells the opposition: "You complain of not having enough time to discuss this question. We will give you the opportunity to debate it further, though you have spent your time interrupting the work which could otherwise have been done. We offer you the opportunity of further debate, by way of three extra sittings. We offer you the opportunity to make your point." But what, the opposition refuses this democratic offer.

How do they expect the people to believe them when they will say that we have gagged them, while we have followed the course of wisdom in adopting the bill within a prescribed time.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding my remarks, and in case there is a misunderstanding as to the closure rule to which my hon. friend from Quebec West referred a moment ago, I would like to state—

(Text):

An hon. member tells me that I have three minutes left. I believe I have six minutes, but I will leave that to the chairman to decide.

(Translation):

The hon. member for Quebec West cried out that, contrary to all democratic principles, we are refusing them the freedom of speech we cherish and which has been conquered by our forefathers and our great Canadian heroes who have died on the battlefields. We have used the right conferred upon us by the rules, which were imposed and referred to by the Conservative party. Well, we are using it to good purpose, and the difference between the decisions of the Speaker and the lack of freedom of speech in the Quebec parliament, and what is happening in this federal parliament, is that here it is not the prime minister who rules on points of order, but the Speaker himself, whose authority is adequate to maintain order and who, in support of his rulings, brings in recognized authorities on parliamentary procedure.