

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

touch this thing with a 10-foot pole. On the one hand he clamours and clamours for Canadians to invest, or to have the privilege of investing, in a pipe line in Canada. On the other hand he says we have not the money in this country for it. Let us have investment. That is the picture. Let us invest. What for? For political purposes only.

That is all we have had from this side of the house in opposition to this bill. The great Conservative party, or the once great Conservative party—probably I should modify it—stands up in this house day after day and for political purposes states that it is for Canadians. They say, "We want this for Canadians and for Canadians only." They have the chance to invest up to 51 per cent, and it has been said up to 60 per cent, in this line; yet those who have the money are not willing to come forward and invest a 10-cent piece in it. They, the great emancipators of the Canadian way of life, the great parliamentarians, deliberately went out of their way time and time again to try to get kicked out of the house for defying the chairman.

There is no man who enjoys freedom and who wishes for it more than I do, but at the same time I feel there is a time and a place for everything. At the beginning of the discussion of this bill we opposed closure, and we would do it again under similar circumstances. Along with the opposition we would oppose the invoking of closure if they had continued to devote their time to discussing this particular bill. Oh, no; we spent two full days discussing nothing but procedure.

I am satisfied that it is up to the opposition to protect our rights. I am also satisfied that I must make up my mind on one of two things. We want this bill for the people of the country. Possibly we can show our good faith by not supporting closure, as we did at the beginning. Perhaps we should give the government the opportunity to bring in this legislation and discuss the merits of the bill, and then go back to the people and let them know what an arrogant government we have and that they should reduce the majority or eliminate it altogether. Certainly we should not use the method that has been used here day after day, particularly after the Prime Minister has been good enough to suggest that those of us who are prepared to support the bill are willing to sit here Wednesday night and all day Saturday.

It will be noticed that none of the Social Crediters spoke yesterday. Why? Because we wanted to give the opposition a chance to talk about the bill. What did they do? They talked about closure and procedure for most of the time. In so far as we are concerned

[Mr. Hahn.]

the matter now rests on this base. The opposition do not want the natural gas line built. We have heard time and time again foolish utterances from children on this side who say, "Oh, this pipe-line bill could wait a couple of years; it does not mean very much to the people of Canada."

Well, let me read to them—perhaps they are not listening and will not be able to understand if one does read—the report of the royal commission on the metropolitan development of Calgary and Edmonton. Their findings are found in chapter 10 at pages 14 and 15. I do not intend to devote the whole of my time to reading this report, but I think it is important that they understand that this report is based on the development of the oil industry in the province of Alberta. It tells us something about what its effect might be upon the rest of the people of this country. Section 7 says in part, in dealing with resource development and urban growth:

What is forgotten however, is that every great development of natural resources causes the cities and towns to grow much more than the farming, forest, and mining frontiers which are being developed.

There we have the matter of indirect growth. I am satisfied that those areas in which farm implements are manufactured realize there would not be any farm implement industry if there were no agricultural west. Reading on we find that the same thing is going to apply and does apply in the oil industry. I continue:

In the post-war oil and construction boom in Alberta too, the bulk of the population increase so generated has been elsewhere, especially in the United States and eastern Canada.

The province of Alberta has not enjoyed the great increase in population, although it has enjoyed some of it. Its effect has been elsewhere, especially in the United States and in eastern Canada. Do not let anyone here tell us that the oil industry does not affect the rest of Canada, and particularly the eastern part of Canada.

In the last paragraph on page 15 we read this:

Again, out of the oil investment in 1952 in the province, of some \$360 million (excluding payments to the government) only some \$44 million appears to have been spent directly within the province.

Where do you suppose the rest of it was spent, in Timbuktu or in some place like that? It was spent right here in the eastern part of Canada and in the United States. Let us not be so childish in our attitude toward this thing. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway suggested that they were challenged, and I am satisfied he did so in good faith. He came back to this house and tried