

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

Mr. Rowe: They never closed it like this.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Perhaps the hon. gentleman—

Mr. Rowe: I was here. You were not.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): —is relying upon his memory as to what took place at that time. Many of us have been reading the official reports of what took place at that time, and there the situation is on all fours with the present situation—

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): —subject only to the exception that there are seven clauses here while there were only three in that case. But there is a title here as there was in the other case. There are clauses here that have not been individually called as there were clauses in the former case that had not been individually called.

Mr. Rowe: The first one was called.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Well, I do not know that there is any very special difference arising out of the fact that the first one was called.

Mr. Rowe: There certainly is.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If the argument submitted has any validity at all it has as great validity with respect to any one of the clauses as it has with respect to the first clause.

Mr. Rowe: We understand why you did not call it.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Well, I do not know what the hon. gentleman has in his mind in saying that we did not call it. I have said we did call it and we moved that its further consideration be postponed because we wanted to get as soon as possible to what was more than the shell so that those hon. members who really did want to discuss the purposes, the method of financing and the powers of this crown corporation could have an early opportunity of doing so.

Mr. Fleming: Your solicitude is most touching. You did not want a general discussion and the right to ask questions on clause 1. That is what you wanted to avoid.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Has there been any objection raised from this side of the house to the general discussion that has been taking place on the part of those who wanted to discuss the bill?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fleming: Scores of questions that have been asked remain unanswered.

Mr. Sinclair: Martyred St. Donald.
[Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East).]

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Perhaps the hon. gentleman might indicate what are those questions that have been unanswered. There were some questions submitted the other evening in a quite amusing speech by the hon. member for Peel.

Mr. Rowe: None of them answered either.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I think if the hon. gentleman will read the report of the questions asked by the hon. member for Peel he will realize that if all those matters had to be ascertained in advance this country would not have reached the stage it has reached in its development at the present time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Some persons have some faith in the future of this country, the kind of faith that Sir John A. Macdonald and his associates had when they attempted to build a railway right across the country.

Mr. Rowe: He would have been ashamed of you today.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Well—

Mr. Rowe: So would Sir Wilfrid.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):—I do not know about that. That is the hon. gentleman's opinion. I have my opinion about the propriety of our conduct and I will be prepared to defend that conduct in every quarter where it may be challenged.

Mr. Rowe: Let us go to the country and ask the people.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): We will be going to the country in due course—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): —and I am prepared to meet such criticism as is being offered at the present time. The hon. gentleman says: Why not go now? Well, we have asserted and we firmly believe that it is in the interests of the country to get this project started this year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I am wandering from the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry and I do apologize. I have submitted to you that we are proceeding upon a valid precedent that is applicable to the present situation and that on the strength of that precedent you should not entertain the point of order that has been submitted.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the contention that the Prime Minister's motion is out of order. Indeed, in doing so