

*Trans-Canada Pipe Lines*

press in Saskatchewan and to which the minister took some exception. The minister at that time made this statement:

C.C.F. members oppose the move as useless, although it was supported by farm organizations.

Then he went on to point out that one member had argued against the cash advances resolution. He was asked who it was, when the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said:

Might I ask who was the hon. member concerned, because I have no recollection of this.

The minister replied:

I said one member, in his remarks in this house, had described it as useless.

Mr. Coldwell: Well, who was that? I have no recollection.

There was no answer. So on that occasion the minister was making reference to something which had gone on in this house, but he could not even give us the name of the individual who was supposed to have made this statement.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):** May I ask a question of the hon. member?

**Mr. Ellis:** Certainly.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):** Do you honestly want to know who the member was to whom I was referring?

**Mr. Ellis:** You know now. You did not know then.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):** I knew then because I quoted from his remarks from page 517 of *Hansard*. When a member stands up in this house and says that a proposal is too little and too late and not only is inadequate but stupid I would assume that is somewhat comparable to the word "useless" and that he is opposed to the legislation.

**Mr. Ellis:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure we are all pleased that the minister in the interim has discovered who was the member concerned, because certainly at page 1555 of *Hansard* on November 27 he did not know.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the hon. member that I knew exactly at that time who was the person. I quoted from his remarks in *Hansard* and all I was doing at that time was avoiding the embarrassment of the member in front of his colleagues.

**Mr. Ellis:** I suggest the hon. member would have preferred being named because I am sure that having made the statement he would be quite capable of backing it up.

Some reference was made in the earlier part of the minister's remarks to private business in my own home city of Regina and,

[Mr. Ellis.]

in some obscure manner, the minister tried to tie this in with the question of pipe lines. I think when the hon. member from Saskatchewan, who should know better and has listened over the years as I have listened to the type of remarks made by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) and other members of the Liberal party from Saskatchewan and who realizes how utterly ridiculous were those charges, should know better than to repeat this nonsense on the floor of the House of Commons.

I suggest to him that if he feels that every small business should be investigated and if he is opposed to the manner in which business is carried on in the country, that is his privilege but when we are dealing with pipe lines we are dealing first with a monopoly. A pipe line by its very nature is a monopoly. Furthermore, when we are dealing with Trans-Canada Pipe Lines we are dealing with a monopoly created through the use of public funds and I suggest there is absolutely no parallel between an ordinary business—whether it be a theatre or a grocery store or any other type of small business—and a public monopoly or a monopoly created out of the use of public funds.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):** Would the hon. member permit a question. Does the hon. member want to tell this house that a \$150,000 business—either a theatre or a grocery store—is a small proposition?

**Mr. Ellis:** I do not think the minister really expects that hon. members in this house are going to become exercised over what they know to be a normal business procedure in all of the businesses in this country and I would think that, as a defender of free enterprise, he would be the last one in the world to allege that a businessman in the entertainment field or in business generally could in any way be compared to Mr. Tanner, Mr. Coates, Mr. Murchison, Mr. McMahon and others who were described by his own leader as buccaneers.

I would suggest that when reference is made to a smear attack on the personnel of the royal commission, as was made earlier, members on the government side should explain the evidence upon which the present Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) in 1956 called Mr. Tanner and Mr. Coates buccaneers.

Apparently the hon. gentleman had sufficient evidence in his possession upon which to formulate his judgment and I suggest that because the member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) places on the record of this house the business connections of certain gentlemen it does not constitute an attack or a smear. Now if the hon. gentlemen opposite want to consider that the