

guaranteed a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway of \$60 million; and at that period less than 13 per cent of the stock of that company was owned in Canada.

This government has been called the "government by order in council", or the "order in council government". That loan was granted by R. B. Bennett by order in council. He did not bring it before parliament, and it was not tabled until the next session. I suggest that \$60 million is an enormous amount of money because in that period, 1933, it constituted 20 per cent of our total federal revenue, and today it would be the equivalent of over \$900 million, based on today's revenue. I wish to make it abundantly clear, however, that I am not criticizing the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. Fulton: Your government permitted inflation.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): I would suggest that under the Tory party of that time God knows anyone who could get a loan needed it, individuals as well as large corporations, because I went through that period with my two hands in salt water trying to make a living and I know how hard R. B. Bennett tried to make it for me to live at all. Therefore I can realize why large corporations and individuals would need a little help. But might I say of this period that while a \$60 million loan out of a total revenue of \$300 million was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, R. B. Bennett could find only 20 cents a day for the poor working man who could not find a job. The amount involved in this bill that we have been trying to discuss here is less than 2 per cent of our total revenue; in fact, 1.7 per cent.

We have heard all this talk about United States domination, lending money to a company that is not owned within Canada, but here is an example of the great government of R. B. Bennett that lent 20 per cent of the total revenue of 1933 to a company that was 83 per cent owned outside this country of ours.

Mr. Pearson: By order in council.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): I should like to take a few minutes to deal with some criticism that was handed out by the hon. member for Eglinton. I understand that for some cause he was called out of order. Tonight I noticed that the hon. member for Hamilton West used these words when speaking of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, "under suspicious circumstances". Well, now, in my opinion and in the opinion of a great many in this house, the drama that was put on last Friday, a week ago today, was prearranged and premeditated well in advance. It came to a conclusion, however, as a result of what

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

was called the refusal of the chairman to allow the hon. member for Eglinton to speak.

I have gone over *Hansard* of three days only, May 23, 24 and 25. I find that the name of the hon. member for Eglinton appears as speaking 118 times during that three-day period. If the 264 members had taken the same amount of time we would have had 31,152 speeches, and if the average length of their speeches had been five minutes, not 15 minutes or 20 minutes, it would have taken 155,760 minutes or 2,596 hours.

Now, we all know that the average hours of sitting of this house over the week are five hours a day. If this is broken down I find it would take 519 sitting days to provide all the members the same privilege accorded the hon. member for Eglinton during those three days. With a five-day week, which is what we have been working, it would take—and I want hon. members to remember those figures—104 weeks or exactly two years without any recess at all to give all members of the House of Commons the same length of time that was given to the hon. member for Eglinton. He is the hon. gentleman who spoke over the radio and over television and was quoted in the press and had parades in the city of Toronto. I understand that thousands turned up at the airport.

Some hon. Members: Twenty-six.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): I leave it to the house and to the citizens of this country to judge for themselves whether the hon. member for Eglinton was denied the right to speak in the House of Commons.

Mr. Fulton: Get the figures accurately; don't distort them.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): Was there some question? I would like to say at this point, for the benefit of the hon. member to my left, that he should remember those figures. Those 104 weeks, or two years, would take us to clause 4 of this bill; that is all. It would take us 104 weeks to reach clause 4 because that is where we were when the flag was put on the hon. gentleman's desk and he bowed out of the House of Commons. I leave it to the house and to the citizens of this country, as I have said, to judge whether the hon. member for Eglinton had been denied the right to speak in this house.

I want to say just a few words about closure.

Mr. Fulton: When are you going to get to the pipe line?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): Over four months ago this government and the people of this