

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

to use the terms "mother of parliaments" and "cradle of democracy", with which these halls would have been ringing yesterday, because closure is a common practice there.

Mr. Fulton: Not on the first day of debate.

Mr. Pickersgill: Even before the first day.

Mrs. Shipley: I do not understand how they can use the term "dictatorship" when such is not the case. I went to the trouble of counting the number of times closure has been used in England and in the last seven years it has been used an average of 21 times per session, so, so much for your dictatorship. Furthermore, we were informed by one of the would-be leaders of the official opposition—

An hon. Member: Which one?

Mrs. Shipley: I will tell you in a minute.

Mr. Dickey: You are covering the waterfront now.

Mrs. Shipley: This hon. member announced in Toronto several weeks ago, I believe, that if we thought we had a filibuster last session—of course he did not use that awful word; he called it something else, but that is what he meant—we had not seen anything yet. Therefore it is a little late, I would think, for the opposition to suggest for one moment that they did not intend to engage in obstruction of the discussion of this subject rather than debate.

Mr. Fulton: Remember what happened last session. The government retreated.

Mrs. Shipley: There is one other point to which I think I may refer. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition used the expression "tawdry and nauseating inversion of the truth." When I examined *Hansard* this morning I was delighted to note that even he could not stomach the word "nauseating" because it has now been changed to "insinuating".

Mr. Gardiner: Oh, changing *Hansard*.

Mrs. Shipley: From the beginning of this debate there has been misrepresentation of fact, misrepresentation of what the minister has said, from start to finish. I have watched it and have made many notes by way of proof. Yesterday I asked the Leader of the Opposition to state at what time and where the Minister of Trade and Commerce had ever said or suggested that the offer of 51 per cent of the stock to Canadians would guarantee control by Canadians. Of course, as all hon. members know, the Leader of the Opposition said he had not said such a thing. I want to refer to page 2172 of *Hansard* of

March 15 of this year, where I find that the Leader of the Opposition had this to say:

He said that control of this company is open to Canadians. That statement is a shallow pretence. That statement has no meaning and is not borne out by the facts.

At other places he said it was an attempt to deceive the Canadian people. Here is exactly what the minister said when he made his statement to the house a few minutes before the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition to which I have referred. As found at page 2166 of *Hansard* of March 15 the minister said:

This offer has, to my surprise, been met with criticism, even derision, on the ground that it provides no guarantee that Canadians will buy the stock. Of course there is no such guarantee. Short of public ownership . . . I know of no means by which control by Canadians could be guaranteed.

The minister has been most meticulous in making that specifically clear any time he has ever mentioned the subject. Then every time any reference is made to Trans-Canada Pipe Lines it is referred to by the members of the opposition as our "protégé" or our "chosen instrument". Again and again it has been said, Mr. Chairman, that we did not choose the company. The company was chosen by the province of Alberta. At the time Alberta had surplus gas and was about to permit the export of that gas beyond its provincial boundaries there were two companies and two companies only that applied to the province of Alberta for such permission. Alberta was not quite satisfied that one company alone would be able to finance and handle the surplus gas, so ultimately there was an amalgamation or a shotgun wedding; I do not care what you call it. There was an amalgamation of the two companies.

Therefore at no time did we select the company. It was the only company with permission to export gas from Alberta, therefore if we wanted an all-Canadian pipe line there was no other company with whom we could deal. The federal government is the one that stipulated that the pipe line must remain on Canadian soil, and the people of northern Ontario are very pleased and happy that this was done. While I am on that particular point I should like to say that it is true there are not enough customers through that long stretch of land to make the line economically sound at the present time, but I venture to say that long before I am dead and gone it will be a happy day for Canada that the gas line came through that area.

It has been said again and again that there were other Canadian investors, but the only ones who have been named are McMahan and Gairdner. It has been pointed out again