

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

was going to be introduced in its original form, a form he told us last July he did not like. Now we have a new form, a much more objectionable form, and we certainly are entitled to an explanation by the Prime Minister as to why this measure is before us in its present form.

But let us go back to the statement by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in trying to compare with others this undertaking where he juggles the funds of the crown corporation to be used for the building of the northern Ontario pipe line so that they are to be used for something entirely different.

Let us just examine this proposal. He compared it with the great venture of the development of the St. Lawrence. There is no comparison whatever. Canada and the United States are working in effective partnership on that project. Then some have compared this proposal with the great venture of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a great difference there. The one thing Sir John A. Macdonald was at all times determined would not happen was that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be tributary to the United States or United States interests. He was determined that it would be a Canadian venture for the benefit of Canadians and that it would not funnel our resources into the United States as will this venture which has been the result of the shotgun marriage performed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. There could not possibly be a greater contrast between two enterprises than between the development of the Canadian Pacific Railway—that great Canadian venture under the guidance of Sir John A. Macdonald—and this shabby sell-out to interests in the United States at the expense of the Canadian taxpayers.

Mr. MacDougall: That is for you to prove.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Chairman, I shall be continuing my remarks after the six o'clock recess, but before then I want to make one thing perfectly clear. This well-trained noise and intervention by hon. members on the opposite side—

Mr. Knowles: On which there is no closure.

Mr. Drew:—and the organized applause of statements of the Minister of Trade and Commerce upon which there is no closure certainly will not deter us in any way from asserting our position. We have heard the boasts of the Prime Minister and his supporters about the support they have in the country. Very well. Let them test that support.

Mr. Rowe: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Drew.]

Mr. Drew: The people of Canada have had no chance to assert an opinion in regard to this matter.

Mr. Rowe: You can't put closure on them.

Mr. Drew: The people of Canada are still in a position where this government cannot invoke closure in their case. The people of Canada are still free to assert their opinion. Let it be remembered that when the C.P.R. was under development the people of Canada did have a chance to express their opinion, and they expressed it in no uncertain manner because they knew it was a Canadian venture.

An hon. Member: They threw the Tories out.

Mr. Drew: It was started by Sir John Macdonald. Sir John Macdonald spoke on behalf of that venture as I hope the Prime Minister of Canada today will speak with regard to the measure that is now before us.

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Drew: We have heard many of these boasts from the opposite side. Let us have a test of their vaunted courage.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It being six o'clock I do leave the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Chairman, the unusual procedure followed by the government today in indicating closure tomorrow gives a different direction than might otherwise have been the case. As I had occasion to point out earlier, this subject was first placed before members of parliament on January 10. We waited until March 15 for the subject to be brought forward by the resolution which now stands as No. 12 on the order paper. There was one day's debate on that resolution to set up a crown corporation. We had waited since then until May 14 for the new resolution to be brought forward. The opposition has indicated over and over again that it wished to discuss this subject. It has sought information. By questions it has tried to find out what was going on. It is true that there have been procedural discussions based on various questions that have been raised and also on the formal introduction of the motion, but this is the first day in a session of over four months that we have even been seized of the motion which is now under discussion.

There is no precedent in our parliamentary records for the course which is now to be