

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

This quotation is taken from a report to the treasurer of Ontario by Clarkson, Gordon and Company and known as the Glassco report. It seems to me that the essentials of a sound natural gas policy are, first of all, that the main pipe line run all the way through Canadian territory. To this policy, this government is dedicated. Secondly, in allocating gas, priority must be given to the needs of the Canadian consumer, whether it be for industrial or domestic use. The export of the gas must take second place, and again in this respect the government is dedicated to this policy.

The third essential is that it must be under effective Canadian control, and again in this respect the government is dedicated to this policy.

Some reference has been made to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway company and to some of the statements made by Sir John A. Macdonald. Of course, all Canadians have great admiration for Sir John A. Macdonald, but was it not necessary to give land grants to encourage the Canadian Pacific Railway to build?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, and they kept it Canadian.

Mr. Decore: With regard to effective Canadian control I would like to draw to the attention of the house a statement which appeared in the *Financial Post Corporation Service*, page 10, card dated September 23, 1955. It reveals that as of December, 1954, the combined stocks or the voting strength of shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway by countries was as follows: At that time Canada had 12·20 per cent; the United Kingdom and other British countries, 46·31 per cent; the United States—and note this—had 33·38 per cent or nearly three times as much as that of Canada; and other countries, 8·11 per cent.

I think these are very interesting figures. They show that the voting strength of the combined stocks held by Canadians was only 12·20 per cent; yet did this mean that the Canadian Pacific Railway company is not being effectively controlled by the people of Canada? Does it make the Canadian Pacific Railway company less Canadian than it should be? We Canadians feel that we can make sacrifices and I think we should be prepared to make them, to assure that this is an all-Canadian pipe line. Surely we could have taken the easy way out and allowed this pipe line to go south of the great lakes rather than north of them. In that event we would not have been called upon either to build the line ourselves through public ownership or to adopt the stand we now adopt. I say, let us be realistic.

[Mr. Decore.]

I do not think there is an hon. member in this house, including the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who feels the trans-Canada pipe line project is completely ideal; but as the *Edmonton Journal* of May 10, 1956, put it:

Of all the schemes proposed for distributing Alberta natural gas, the trans-Canada pipe line project seems, in balance, the best. It is to be hoped that parliament will ratify it without undue delay, so that construction may commence this year.

I have read just the last paragraph of that editorial.

Much has been said during the course of this debate with reference to closure. The fact remains that before the Minister of Trade and Commerce even had a chance to speak to this resolution we had to undergo seven votes in this house. I think the opposition gave their notice of intention concerning what course they wished to follow; in other words, they asked for it.

When the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre spoke tonight about the freedom of debate I think we witnessed a bad example in his attempt to prevent the hon. member for Bow River having his 20 minutes which is allotted by the house. I think, Mr. Chairman, this is a fine example of a closure within a closure.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not try to detract from the 20 minutes of the hon. member for Bow River. I just did not want the time he caused the house to spend on the point of order to be taken from the rest of us, including my hon. friend from Vegreville.

Mr. Decore: Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that nearly 20 minutes was taken by that argument, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did get up and say that time should be counted within the 20 minutes.

Mr. Knowles: Who was responsible for it?

Mr. Decore: In other words, you tried to prevent the hon. member from expressing his views within the 20 minutes allotted to him.

Mr. Fleming: Nonsense. The rules of the house have to be upheld.

Mr. Decore: Of course the same thing can be said with regard to what happened this afternoon when the Conservatives made an attempt to prevent the hon. member for Calgary South from speaking.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made a statement which he must know is entirely untrue. There was no attempt made to stop any hon. member from speaking this afternoon. The time taken by the member for Calgary South was provided