

the great lakes and also contemplating any regulations that apply to the movements of such boats?

Hon. George C. Marler (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell me that he proposed to ask this question. All I can say in reply is that I have been unable to obtain any report of the matter and I shall have to make inquiries.

NATURAL RESOURCES

SASKATCHEWAN—DISCOVERY AND PRODUCTION OF GAS AND OIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. W. Hodgson (Victoria, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. Would the minister care to give the house any information he might have on the discovery and production of oil and gas in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. George Prudham (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, I think that question could be very well discussed when the estimates come before the committee in the very near future.

Mr. Hodgson: I guess you don't know.

NORTHERN ONTARIO PIPE LINE CORPORATION

CONSTITUTION OF CROWN COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT PIPE LINE, MAKE SHORT-TERM LOANS, ETC.

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 29, consideration in committee of Bill No. 298, to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation—Mr. Howe (Port Arthur)—Mr. Applewhaite in the chair.

On clause 4—*Body corporate.*

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Dufresne: Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Dauphin. As this is the second time I seem to have got myself into an embarrassing position, perhaps I might be permitted to make a short statement to the committee. When the committee rose last night the hon. member for Dauphin had not completed the 30 minutes which is allotted to him. I do not know, and I am making no statement, whether or not he is entitled to pick it up now, but I expected that he would claim that right. I saw him first for the simple reason that I was looking for him. I called

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation
“the hon. member for Dauphin” and the hon. member will now address the committee.

Mr. Zaplitny: Mr. Chairman, in the limited time still at my disposal all I can do is to summarize the arguments I was making at ten o'clock last evening and to point out the position in which we find ourselves at the present time in this debate. I think it is amply clear to all fair-minded citizens that the only way in which the public interest of Canada can be safeguarded and the whole project of this Canadian trans-Canada pipe line kept under Canadian ownership is to have it constructed under public ownership. It is now perfectly clear that the government has only one excuse which they have given to this house and to the country for having set this deadline of June 7 and for the way in which they have handled this whole measure before this house and the committee, and that is their claim that that is the only way in which the pipe line can be built. Of course that is a phony excuse because if there has been any delay in commencing construction of this pipe line that delay lies squarely upon the shoulders of the government.

They have had this project under consideration for the last five years. They have been told, at least by members of this group and perhaps by others, that the proper thing to do if we are to have a national pipe line, as it has been described by the government itself, is for the government to proceed to construct the pipe line without waiting for a private company to dip into the public treasury and then own the pipe line.

I think every excuse which the government has brought forward as to why they must meet this deadline of June 7 is full of holes and will not hold water. Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited have been the recipients of all the favours from this government that one could dream up. The company has had several postponements when they were not able or were not inclined to meet deadlines which they themselves had agreed upon. Certainly this pipe line company does not have to hold a stick over the heads of the members of this house and of the government of this country by saying that either we put this through by June 7, or else. I think that is a shabby way in which to treat this parliament and it is a shabby way in which to carry on public business. Certainly the government should have the courage to say to Trans-Canada Pipe Lines and to all concerned, “We consider this to be a national project of great importance. We are going to let the members of this house give their full and mature deliberation to the question, and then, when we have