

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

will not—how can it be argued that they would take 60 per cent, 70 per cent or 80 per cent? How can it be argued that they will take more if more were offered to them if they will not take 51 per cent? My hon. friends' argument is that they will not take 51 per cent. If they will not take 51 per cent they certainly will not take more, so there is no use offering them any more.

We have the evidence of all the experts that this pipe line bill of the government is a good one. All the interested parties support it. The premier of Alberta, Mr. Manning, supports it. The premier of Manitoba gave an interview to the newspapers just recently in which he insisted on the necessity of getting this pipe line built as soon as possible so as to bring the gas to Winnipeg as soon as possible. The premier of Ontario has left the hon. Mr. Drew on the issue. He also says that the policy of the government is a good one. The only ones who still think that the policy of the government is bad are the hon. Mr. Drew and the members who vote for him, and whom I would call trained seals if I was not more polite than he is. Their expert on that side, Mr. Nickle, whom everybody recognizes as an expert in gas and oil, left them on that issue and abandoned his party on that issue. I was told today by someone who was showing me a Calgary newspaper that all of Mr. Nickle's Conservative organization, all of his supporters in his constituency, had backed him on the decision he has taken on the issue.

**Mr. Rea:** You are not supposed to call hon. members by their names in the house.

**Mr. Cannon:** I say, Mr. Chairman, that we have won the battle of the pipe line and the Conservatives are simply trying to win the battle of procedure. Should they win it and they need not think they have won the battle of procedure—it would not do them any good with the people of this country. They should consider themselves lucky that they did not succeed in blocking this thing in the way they have tried to do. It is to their ultimate benefit that they have not been able to block Trans-Canada Pipe Lines. If they had blocked it they would get even fewer votes at the next election than they will get under the present circumstances.

**An hon. Member:** Why don't you try it?

**Mr. Cannon:** The answer was given the other day by the Prime Minister that there was no reason for going to the people now. They think they know the thinking of the people of Canada. They think the people of Canada approve of what they have done. They think they will get the approval of the

[Mr. Cannon.]

people of Canada and therefore they say, "Have an election". Their reason for wanting an election is that they think the people of Canada are backing them, but I think the people of Canada are not backing them and therefore there is no reason to have an election.

**Some hon. Members:** Quiet.

**Mr. Cannon:** On the matter of closure, Mr. Chairman, a very sound argument can be made. Most of my hon. friends on the other side of the house are educated people who have college educations and therefore they will realize what a syllogism is in philosophy. The rules of parliament are democratic. Closure is a rule of parliament and therefore closure is a rule of democracy.

**An hon. Member:** Before debate begins?

**Mr. Cannon:** And the exhibition my hon. friends have put on in this house since the beginning of this debate is ample proof, if we needed it, that closure is an absolutely necessary rule of this house.

Spokesmen of the C.C.F. and Conservative parties gave notice to the newspapers before the debate started that they were going to put on such a filibuster as had never been seen before in this house. They said, "You think you saw a filibuster last year; well, you haven't seen anything yet".

**Mr. Nicholson:** Well, have you?

**Mr. Cannon:** There goes my hon. friend across the way. He says, "Well, have you?" He agrees with me, evidently. He admits that they were going to put on the greatest filibuster that had ever been put on in this house. I say that completely justifies us in imposing the rule of closure. That was the only way we could have achieved constructive debate.

The rules of this house—

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Rules?

**Mr. Cannon:** —were revised by an inter-parliamentary committee in which all the parties of this house were represented and on which the expert of the C.C.F., the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the expert of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Kamloops, and all the experts on procedure in the house served. They went through the rules of parliament with a fine-toothed comb. They made all the changes they thought should be made, but they did not change the closure rule an iota. They left it just as it was before because they realized it was absolutely necessary for the orderly proceedings of debate in this house.