

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

thing in the world they want. Mr. Chairman, I believe they can read and when they do read they will know what the press is saying.

**Mr. Sinclair:** That is what my learned friend is doing, he is reading.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** The whole idea—

**Mr. Sinclair:** He wanted parliamentarians, not readers.

**The Chairman:** Order. It is impossible for me, even at this short distance, to hear the hon. member and I am sure it must be more difficult in other parts of the chamber. I wonder if we could have less noise.

**Mr. Sinclair:** Mr. Chairman—

**Some hon. Members:** Sit down.

**Mr. Sinclair:** It must be very obvious, Mr. Chairman, with his manuscript in his hand, that he is reading.

**The Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Fleming:** No wonder you fell off the ladder.

**The Chairman:** Order. In parliamentary debate, the hon. member must not be interrupted without his consent.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** Mr. Chairman, I hope these interruptions will be taken off my time.

**The Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** I also have a complaint because I was really getting on quite well until this began.

**Mr. Sinclair:** Put your manuscript down and speak from your heart. You have had an expensive education and you should be able to speak from your heart.

**The Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** Mr. Chairman, I want to say—

**Some hon. Members:** It is one o'clock.

**The Chairman:** I hear some hon. members saying, "One o'clock". May I draw their attention to citation 227 in Beauchesne's third edition, and to the new time in standing order 33 which is advanced from two o'clock to one o'clock. The citation reads:

If a member has taken the floor at 1.55 o'clock, he is entitled to speak for 20 minutes, but no member "shall rise to speak" after two o'clock.

The hon. member for Greenwood took the floor at 12.43 and his 20 minutes would accordingly have expired at 1.03. Thereafter, in accordance with standing order 33, the question shall be put and no other member shall rise. I am taking it for granted that I have taken a minute or a minute and a half of the hon. member's time, and I propose to remind him that his time will expire at 1.05.

[Mr. Macdonnell.]

**Mr. Macdonnell:** Now, Mr. Chairman, after all this I have just one other point I should like to make. I have tried to make clear the curious manner in which this business was done and I should like to read here a question and answer addressed to the Prime Minister which gives me a picture of the action of the cabinet. It is very delightful but rather confusing. On page 3482 of *Hansard* for May 2, 1956, the hon. member for Prince Albert asked this question:

Will the Prime Minister table the offer of Frank McMahon and his associates. If the offer is confidential, will he ask McMahon to release the confidentiality so the terms of the offer may be brought before the house?

The Prime Minister said:

Mr. Speaker, I have seen no offer from Mr. Frank McMahon. I will have to inquire from my colleagues if they individually have received a confidential offer. No offer has been brought to the attention of the cabinet.

I mention that because it gives me a curious picture of the Prime Minister going to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and saying, "Have you got a confidential letter?" No. The Minister of External Affairs? No. The Minister of Finance? No. And so he proceeds right across the cabinet. It is a picture that I like to think about but the point I want to make is this. The Leader of the Opposition has been asking for months to have a committee. Why did he want that? So that we might have some knowledge about this, independent knowledge, knowledge from experts. At the present time, we are asked to take a whole lot of unsupported statements made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Now, I have a great respect for the Minister of Trade and Commerce apart from his views on democracy, but I do not think we should be asked to take his or anybody else's unsupported views on these important matters. First of all, we are asked to take his view that Trans-Canada are the only people who can do this. That is not an open and shut proposition. I have heard arguments which would drive a coach and six through that. The facts are not as clear as the minister would indicate. After all, Trans-Canada has gone from one position to another. First of all they were going to build the whole thing. Then the question of the northern Ontario bridge came up; they wanted that and finally they wanted to have the western line built for them too.

As far as the committee is concerned, I suggest there is a whole series of what are now questions which should be turned into matters of fact. For instance, what will be the cost to the eastern consumer? I notice in one of the papers a positive statement