

*Private Bills*

sense in our now compounding the original error of parliament by agreeing that these companies should be able by means of this kind successfully to exploit Canadians who are consumers of oil products to an even greater extent than they have been doing in the past.

I have listened to arguments which suggest that the pipe line companies are carriers. Some people argue they are public carriers. Some of them, I believe, are put in that classification officially and some of them may not be. The fact that the stock of this company was being quoted on the 12th of November at a market figure of \$88 or \$89 is an indication that under the terms and conditions under which this company has been allowed to operate its transportation monopoly its shares have risen and risen and risen and that the reason they have risen to this level is that this company and others like it in fact have been able to earn profits on a completely unrealistic and exorbitant basis in relation to services they are performing as a public utility.

I think these are the sort of considerations we should have in mind when companies like the Interprovincial Pipe Line Company, acting as fronts for the major foreign owners of oil interests in this country, come before parliament with these specious reasons and ask that their stocks be split.

It is, of course, legitimate for companies to be in a position where they earn fair and reasonable dividends on the risk capital they have put into a particular venture, but I submit that the members of this house, when this company was first incorporated, should have been, if they were not, fully aware of the fact that the risk capital involved in this company in the first place was not really being risked. In the second place, it represented only a fraction of the financing that was used and because of this situation this company ever since it came into being has been in a position to exploit the consuming public of Canada.

These are the considerations which some of us have in mind when we quarrel with the statement of the member who introduced this bill to the effect that the reasons proposed for splitting the shares of this company are legitimate. I say again, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, that so far as I am concerned this proposal is not legitimate. It is phony and the house should refuse second reading of this bill without any further delay whatsoever. I feel that under the circumstances and in view of the —

[Mr. Barnett.]

• (7:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired and the hour assigned for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

The house will now resume the business interrupted at six o'clock.

**SUPPLY**

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

**DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE**

15. Operation and maintenance and construction or acquisition of building, works, land and major equipment for the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force and \$1,850,000 for grants to the town of Oromocto, \$1,382,244,000.

**The Chairman:** Shall the item carry?

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Chairman, we were expecting replies to some of the questions we asked with regard to the six cases in which men have been released on pension, and credited with full pensionable service with their enlistment ages put back to ages nine and, in five other cases, 11 and 12. I refer to the report of the Auditor General at pages 55 and 56. Perhaps the associate minister has that information for us now.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne):** I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I do not have it; I presume the minister will be here any minute now.

[*English*]

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Chairman, I would object to the passing of this item before we receive this information. I had the opportunity, last Sunday, as I am sure other members of this house had, of watching a program which, incidentally, is not my favourite one, "This Hour Has 7 Days", but which presented a story of a woman whose husband, while in the process of his duty as a member of the armed forces making a trip between Ottawa and Toronto stopped to eat, as any sensible person might do, and was hit by a car and killed. This case has been before the pension board on many occasions during the past eight years. Yet that board in its wisdom, acting as my lawyer friends might do, has found reasons on every side of the argument to turn down an application for a pension. I find it difficult to understand how the pension board can be so tough in a case of that kind, while at the same time pensions are being given to people in the prime of their lives through the transparent gimmick of dating