

Speaker, to submit this ramshackle caricature of national development to the people of Canada.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that after all it really does not matter where the money comes from or where the control is so long as the laws of Canada are on the statute books. Then, a few moments ago he told us that the reason nothing had been done in recent years was that we need markets in the United States, and because of the opposition before the federal power commission this important project had been held back. In other words, regardless of the laws of Canada the disposal of a great Canadian resource is to depend on the caprice of a foreign board. One can quote Mr. Mackenzie King over and over again when it comes to parliamentary procedure. He spoke on this subject over and over again, but we will go back a little farther than Mr. Mackenzie King. I quote from Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, once the holder of the distinguished position that you occupy, sir. This is what he said on August 30, 1917 and it is so applicable to what is happening here:

This is nothing else but a raid, and it is because it is a raid perpetrated on the Canadian treasury that it has to be done by closure.

That was closure adopted after days of argument.

A raid must be made quickly and sharply, it must be done in the dark far from inquiries . . .

Is that the reason closure was applied? Were you afraid of public discussion? Did you fear the examination of this project? The Prime Minister will be able to give his answer, other than the general answer of yesterday which was the first one prided from him at any time during this debate. What is parliament without debate? Sterilized, it maintains the form and not the soul. Is the government afraid to submit this absurdity to the examination and revealing process of analysis by parliament? Why the adoption the other day of closure in anticipation of debate, a dangerous expedient at any time and an inexcusable one when adopted under the circumstances, before there was any debate in this house or any consideration whatever of the measure?

What is the position of the opposition? The position of the opposition, Mr. King stated over and over again, was the position of a vigilance committee to assure that measures brought before parliament by an overwhelmingly powerful government would not be translated into legislation, when it appeared in any way a raid on the treasury, without a full consideration by parliament. One of the great writers on this subject,

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

Redlich, page 49, volume 1 of his book on parliamentary government, says this:

The feeling of the universal benefit conferred as a rule by strenuous and powerful opposition is one which centuries of experience have worked into the very flesh and blood of the English nation.

Some mention was made today of the fact that in Britain from time to time they apply closure. They have a means in the House of Commons in Britain of securing the facts from any government. They have the right at their disposal, at adjournment time, to move for the discussion of any matter in respect of which they have not received the information that they desire. If closure is brought into effect, it is brought into effect after consultation and determination as between the parties and the Speaker and is designed to assure full discussion while preventing anything in the nature of continuous, unjustifiable opposition to government measures.

Having said that, I repeat that it is a matter of wonder to me that the Prime Minister should have allowed himself to be dominated in the way he must have been to have permitted this inexcusable affront to parliament and this denial of parliamentary rights.

I am now going to discuss something of the nature of the proposals before the house.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** What is the record of this company, Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited? For five long years we have been waiting for action. Throughout that entire period this company has played a monopoly game without chance. Its attitude has been one of artful juggling. It has changed its front from year to year. From year to year this cobweb of colourful finance has been spun.

They started with the idea that they could finance themselves. They said they needed no government help. They secured an incorporation on that basis, and having designedly made the allegation that under no circumstances would they ask for assistance, they began that tortuous course they have followed ever since. First they said, "We will ship directly to the Ontario and Quebec markets and provide the necessary pipe line." Their next attitude was, "We will change that; we need United States markets and we will build a spur line to the United States boundary and that spur line will supply the great needs of the middle west."

They were able to contact in the United States three companies named by the Minister of Trade and Commerce who were prepared to pay a real price, a price far in excess of what is to be paid today by the