

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

involved that would bar me from voting on the measure and, indeed, to prove that personal financial gain plays no part whatsoever in the various policies I have urged, the speeches I have made, and the votes I have joined in in this house.

I do not question in any way the right, the duty or the purpose of the hon. members in raising the question at 2.17 a.m. on May 23. I do say, however, that the reply I am now going to give is the one I would have given at that time had I been an expert on rules and procedure or a lawyer, neither of which I am, or had I had advance notice of the question as to my eligibility, which I did not, or had the question not been raised at the end of an extremely long sitting under circumstances requiring some immediate answer from me without opportunity to consider fully or prepare a detailed factual answer. Since then I have flown west to Calgary, and have gathered the necessary documentary evidence, all of which will be made available to the appropriate house committee and to the members who raised the question. Since, sir, it is unlikely that the committee can sit in the near future because of pressure of work in the house I will now present a short summary of the evidence and reiterate that, with a completely clear conscience, I intend to vote again on this bill.

Personally I would regard as "direct pecuniary interest" barring me from voting any shareholdings in Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited, the company to be directly affected by this measure. I have no such interest, and as I said on May 23:

I state unequivocally that I have no share interest whatsoever in Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited and no shares whatsoever in any company which is a shareholder in Trans-Canada.

I will now quote from a document dated May 25, 1956, from the head office of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited, which document states in part:

Carl O. Nickle . . . does not own any shares in Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited and has no other rights, title or option, direct or indirect, to acquire any shares in this company. The books and records of the company do fully substantiate the above statement.

The move to bar my vote, however, was not based on any claim that I had a direct interest in Trans-Canada but rather that a company of which I was a director had entered into a contract to sell gas to Trans-Canada. Thus this presumed "indirect pecuniary interest" should be construed to be a "direct interest".

If even the slightest measure of indirect pecuniary interest may be deemed to bar a member from voting on this measure, then

[Mr. Nickle.]

perhaps all members in the following categories might be disallowed: (1) All members from Alberta, on grounds that every Albertan will gain from revenues to the provincial treasury from royalties on gas produced from crown lands; (2) All members from communities, including Winnipeg, that will be served with gas through Trans-Canada, unless they are prepared to commit themselves not to use gas, because otherwise they would be direct beneficiaries of lower costs to consumers made possible by the government assistance involved in this measure; (3) All members who are shareholders of any company with gas reserves in Alberta, or shareholders in any gas distribution system in the five province area to be served by Trans-Canada; (4) in fact, we might bar all members because all members of this house are taxpayers.

I will now comment specifically on the grounds advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in his contention that my vote should be disallowed. It would appear that he believes the degree of presumed pecuniary interest should determine whether or not a member's vote should be disallowed and that he assumes I have such a greater degree of pecuniary interest than other members because of associations with oil and gas companies that I should, therefore, be singled out.

When he raised the question he stated, as found at page 4241 of *Hansard* of May 22:

The information on which I raise this point is found in documents which are matters of record. I refer to the Parliamentary Guide, and I also refer to the *Financial Post's* directory of boards of directors. One can ascertain from these documents that the hon. member for Calgary South is the president, the vice-president or a director of at least nine oil, gas or pipe line companies.

His statement was misleading. My positions with these companies are a matter of public record, and always have been, partly because I have as a matter of policy tried to ensure that parliament, the public and the readers of my publications should not be under any misapprehensions as to my business relationships and partly also because shareholdings of directors of public companies are required by law to be matters of public record. Had the hon. member cared to examine other documents of public record, he could have given to the house complete details as to my shareholdings, gas reserves, contractual relationships with Trans-Canada, and so on.

To overcome that omission, I have obtained from each company of which I am a director or officer a document setting out, first, my shareholdings and percentage equity, second, their gas reserves, if any, and my equity in them and, third, their relationships with Trans-Canada, if any. These are available