

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

all. The agreement states there is to be deducted from that \$7,500,000, and regarded as part of the expenditure, any expenditure already made which could be properly attributable to that western section. How much is that? We do not know. The only way we could find out would be if this whole subject were referred to a committee, as I suggested to the Prime Minister. We have a right to know exactly the amount that is going to be attributable to that western section, and to know how much is actually going to be paid under this clause of the agreement.

This is typical of the kind of device which makes it so essential that we place this matter before a committee. Time? Certainly there is time, if that is the right course, and we know the only right course with a bill of this kind is to place it before the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines or a select committee, whichever the government prefers, so the information can be obtained.

There are, of course, a number of other details which do not need to be enlarged upon at this time, but there was one statement made in the house last Tuesday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that was interesting. These were his words:

My officers inform me also that the earliest delivery date for orders for 34-inch pipe placed now would be not earlier than the fourth quarter of 1957. Therefore to abandon Trans-Canada in favour of any other private group was to abandon any hope of a start on the western section of the pipe line in 1956 and perhaps in 1957.

What does that mean? Does that mean the Tennessee gas interests are holding a gun to the government's head? That is what it means if it means anything at all. It means that they say, "We have the pipe and nobody else gets it". How about this government for once dealing on a basis that would represent the interests of Canada, and not being told by interests in the United States whether we will or will not have 34-inch or any other type of pipe for an undertaking of this kind? If 34-inch pipe is not available to us the only people who are to blame are the members of the government of Canada. If that pipe is available then these people who have received so much consideration are morally bound to deliver that pipe to this government. Unless they were prepared to do so then I should think any further negotiations with them would hardly be negotiations with a party who was prepared to deal on terms of fairness and equity with our government. The Tennessee gas interests and their associates are calling the tune. It is the Tennessee gas or nothing. That is the kind of independence which this government has declared.

[Mr. Drew.]

Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce made perhaps his most interesting statement as reported at page 3664 of *Hansard*:

In my view the prospect of public ownership of a natural gas pipe line is not one that should arouse enthusiasm.

That is an understatement if I ever heard one.

On the other hand if public ownership is the only way in which this great national enterprise can proceed, we should not refuse to grasp the nettle. In a country like Canada it is of the greatest importance, however, that private enterprise should be given an adequate opportunity and every reasonable facility to do the job.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drew: I hear a triumphant chorus of "hear, hear" from hon. members opposite.

Mr. Garson: This speech is getting better every minute.

Mr. Drew: Are you hear-hearing for public ownership or private enterprise, because they are both included in that?

An hon. Member: You tell us.

Mr. Drew: It would be interesting to know which you are really supporting.

Mr. Rowe: Some blow hot and some blow cold.

Mr. Drew: We do not believe that Canadian private enterprise has been given an adequate opportunity and every reasonable facility to do this job. We know that private enterprise has been trying to get a chance to participate in this undertaking, and it has been denied.

Let us go back to the words which preceded these:

... if public ownership is the only way in which this great national enterprise can proceed, we should not refuse to grasp the nettle.

These were the words that received the most applause from the organized cheering gang opposite. When the Minister of Trade and Commerce talks about fairness to Trans-Canada, may I suggest that the promoters of Trans-Canada examine those words. What was behind the applause? Was it a tip-off that there really was not much chance of Trans-Canada completing this portion by next March; that everything would be quite all right, and that they were really going to be forced into public ownership at that time? I think it is about time Trans-Canada looked at this matter, because the government is trying to put two sides of a coin before their people and get approval of both sides.

If Trans-Canada cannot put up the money to build the easiest part of the line now, how are they going to build the rest of the line?