

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

house; the house has an opportunity to debate such policies and by its decision indicate what it thinks are proper policies. In my short time in the House of Commons I have seen the odd time when the government has recognized as good some ideas that have come from the opposition. That has not been very frequent, but they have accepted some of those ideas. But on this most important matter—no debate. If the government had been faced with a long debate where it had got to the point that there was a repetition of speeches by the opposition, they might have had some excuse to put on closure. I think there is absolutely no excuse for putting on closure the second day, and this government will live to regret the action it has taken.

When I prepared my speech I put it in two parts. The first part was to discuss this company, and the next part was to discuss the policy we in the C.C.F. thought the government or the people of Canada should put into effect. Under the 20-minute rule our leader was not able last night to bring out the policy of the party in this regard as well as cover the other matters that are in the resolution.

However, first of all I want to protest against the unholy alliance and this wildcat scheme the government has at the present time. What is the position of Trans-Canada today? They want to build a pipe line on a shoestring. They do not have any money. They want the people of Canada to build a pipe line for them; then they will operate it, control it and make the profits that are to be made out of it.

This company came before the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines in 1951 and made a number of commitments. I had intended to put some of those commitments on the record, but I have not time to do that. A great many of those commitments they have not been able to carry out. The whole picture has changed. From what they said in 1951 the picture has changed very materially. To be brief, I claim that this company after five years has shown a total inability to fulfil its contract. It is not worthy of any further consideration, and should be ruled out of the picture at the present time.

Now I want to deal with what the minister said about the only other alternative policy. I am one of those who recognize that the province of Alberta has a tremendous amount of gas it wants to sell. We realize that, and we want them to have the opportunity to get rid of that gas. We recognize also that power and heat are needed more and more as eastern Canada has been growing so rapidly, and we want to see these two brought

[Mr. Campbell.]

together. But to do that we have to have something more than a company that is built on a shoestring.

The minister, speaking yesterday, made the statement that there was only one other alternative, and that he did not want that because it would not be very popular with some people. I do not think "popular" was the word he used. This is what he said, as recorded on page 3860 of *Hansard*:

No criticisms or tags such as "chosen instrument" here cast upon Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited will alter the fact that only that company has gathered together the gas purchase and sales contracts, the governmental permits, the organization and the access to pipe which make possible a start this year upon the pipe line.

There is no indication there that this line will be built to Winnipeg this year, but the minister says they are the only ones who can make a start. I just want to analyse that short sentence, "the fact that only that company has gathered together the gas purchase and sales contracts."

This company cannot fulfil its contracts. This company cannot fulfil those contracts it made with the province of Alberta. The province of Alberta is going to sell that gas to whoever has the pipe line. There is no question about that. If the government set up a crown corporation to build that pipe line right through Canada, would there be any doubt that the province of Alberta would sell that gas? They have to get rid of it. Then I come to the sales contracts. Do you mean to say that people in eastern Canada are too much interested in who is going to operate the pipe line, as long as they get gas?

An hon. Member: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Campbell: No, I will not.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Campbell: Does the minister or anybody on the other side of the house—and they may follow me whenever they like—say that the people who want to use gas in eastern Canada are going to turn down the possibility of getting gas if it is operated by a government agency? Absolutely no. Those contracts are just as good for a pipe line operated by a crown corporation as they are for the present company, which cannot fulfil its commitments.

An hon. Member: Who is going to get a permit to transport it?

Mr. Campbell: That is all right.

Mr. Fleming: Speak at the proper time.

Mr. Campbell: Just keep your mouth buttoned up for a while. The minister says this is the only company that has access to pipe,