

Interim Supply

speech from the minister, and that entitles me to another half hour. I will not take advantage of anyone.

I want to appeal once more to the government, in the interests of this country's future, to reconsider this last decision; once more to read the arguments the Prime Minister used in his statement of August 25, and to see how they apply to the situation which has not changed in any way. A subsidiary of Trans-Canada states that the situation has not been altered in any way, shape or form. I say that the August 25 position was the better one. All I can do at this stage is to make an appeal to the government. We will not continue this debate ad nauseam, pounding away at this. We make this appeal, but if we cannot make the government listen to reason, then we shall find other ways of fighting that which we feel to be detrimental to the future of Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I decided to speak on interim supply, and particularly about the government finding money at the last moment. I should like to answer some arguments raised about the pipe line issue. In passing, let me say that I have always thought the House of Commons was divided more by people coming from different regions than by people belonging to different parties. I believe if the N.D.P. had members from Alberta or from Saskatchewan, or Manitoba—which they have not—they would claim to speak for the country. They would talk about this pipe line, and how it affects the economy of the west. More than that I will not say, except to remind my hon. friends once again that the National Energy Board was set up with its experts; that it has the capacity to analyse whether we can export energy from this country, and still retain enough for the foreseeable needs of our country.

I made my arguments on a previous occasion when speaking in the house.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a question?

Mr. Woolliams: I have only a few moments.

Mr. Douglas: Is it not true that the gas would be still sold from the west, whether it went through Ontario or through the United States?

Mr. Woolliams: My hon. friend knows what I have said, and I shall not quibble. If we put the pipe line through the north—and we already have one Trans-Canada pipe line—by the time we get through to southern Ontario

[Mr. Martin (Timmins).]

the United States companies, such as Standard Oil and all those, will have the gas in the market, and we shall be cut out. The hon. member knows that this way the cost is 15 per cent less. The last time I spoke my hon. friend called my arguments tommyrot. I told him his name was Tommy Douglas, and that ended the argument in that regard.

Mr. Douglas: That was not very good.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not intend to get into a fight, but western Canada has a position to protect. My hon. friend, who was a former premier of a province, is not the member for the city of Regina because he had to leave that city and go to British Columbia to be elected. This was because he did not support western Canada's interests. The people out there came to that conclusion, and they dismissed him.

Mr. Douglas: Oh—

Mr. Woolliams: That is a fact. However, I do not intend to be sidetracked from my remarks about interim supply.

We, on this side of the house have been accused of prolonging the debate on interim supply by talking about a defence matter. We also have had the pipe line discussion. I draw to the attention of my hon. friends opposite, through you Mr. Chairman, that this afternoon an hon. member said that 30 per cent of debating time on interim supply was taken up by government speakers. I do not know how much time was taken by the N.D.P. on the pipe line, but it is safe to say that probably 50 per cent of the time of debate was taken by hon. members who are other than Conservative.

Also, as pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre I believe, the rules limit debate on interim supply and estimates to 30 days. Therefore, when we discuss matters such as defence during that period, we are not wasting the time of parliament because 30 days have been allocated for such debates. After all, the government was not in jeopardy. They found the money. They argued that we, on this side of the house were stopping the pay cheques, but they had the money after all. They found it at the last moment. Surely, they cannot have their cake and eat it.

I agree that there ought to be some provision whereby civil servants should get their pay cheques without being subjected to what has happened, and in order that issues might be debated more freely. I congratulate the