

Mr. Coldwell: Would be called.

Mr. Knight: He said that tenders would be called for that particular part of the work. Therefore my fifth question to the minister is, just exactly what does that article mean?

I have already expressed myself at the beginning of my remarks with regard to the method by which the government has rail-roaded or is railroading—I think that is a correct expression—this legislation through the house. A former Liberal prime minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, expressed very strenuous objection to the gag or guillotine in 1932. Well, the gag, closure, the guillotine, call it what you will, is the method by which Mr. King's successors are forcing this pipe line bill upon a reluctant people about half of whom, I would say, are represented by the party on my right and our own party but have no representation or effective voice in this so-called representative assembly.

Then there was another and greater Liberal, and with his words I close. I think someone has already put them on the record. I refer to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the time when he had the opportunity to apply closure but refused to do so and went to the country instead where he suffered defeat. King also went to the country but he was returned victorious. Laurier was defeated and on his return to the house as a member of the opposition after that defeat he said:

Heaven is my witness that I would rather stand here today, defeated and in opposition by that appeal to the people, than to stand over there in office by the power of the gag.

My last and concluding sentence is that there are no Lauriers on the treasury benches of today.

Mr. Pallett: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak in this debate I feel somewhat like a member of Sir Francis Drake's crew when he went out against the armada. They were facing bigger guns and bigger ships but they won because they had better ammunition and better leadership. In view of certain headlines I have seen in Ottawa papers today, I would remind the Prime Minister that at the beginning of this week he assured the house that we would have a debate all this week. I took it, and I believe most hon. members took it, that there would be a debate on the pipe line issue and that there would not be measures introduced by the government that would take the debate away from the pipe line issue to other matters of procedure that are necessary to us in the opposition when the government decides to use closure measures. I say that to the Prime Minister so that there will be no misunderstanding in his mind as to what was understood on this side of the house and what, I

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

believe, was understood by the people of Canada. The Prime Minister has given an undertaking to this house that we would have debate this week on the pipe line. I remind hon. gentlemen as to that.

Mr. Hosking: Just read it.

Mr. Pallett: Certain headlines that have appeared in the Ottawa papers today do not indicate that. I certainly feel that those ideas do not come out of some reporter's own mind.

Last night the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his opening remarks said this as reported at page 4404 of *Hansard*:

. . . I have spoken three times in this debate, and my purpose in rising now is to attempt to make this a committee where questions that are asked can be answered.

To that end I have prepared certain questions that I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I would suggest that if he likes I will send them over to him after I have finished and he can answer them in due course. I should like the answers to be answers from him, not references to agreements and not references to submissions that have been made by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines in any hearings or in any letters that have been filed before this house. I think it has been shown conclusively that any representations by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited in any hearings or in any agreements are not to be considered too seriously.

In this house today we heard the hon. member for Prince Albert read figures of the gas sale price filed by that company before the federal power commission of the United States. The first man on his feet to deny those figures was the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think that sets the stage exactly and shows how much reliance we can put in statements that are made on behalf of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited. The first man effectively to say that their word, filed before a judicial tribunal, is not to be taken as true was the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the sponsor of this bill.

The questions to which I referred are as follows. First I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what has been done since January 1, 1951 up until the present time. Let us have the facts in relation to what has been done in the last five years. Why is it only now, or within the last few weeks, that this bill has been put down for consideration? What has been happening since January 10 when this session first started? I think that is a question that ought to be answered for the Canadian people.