

*Appropriation Act No. 8*

available markets today, and in the foreseeable future.

I think the hon. member should also take into account the fact that Albertans are Canadians too. We have the right to expect the kind of action by this government and this parliament that will be conducive to the expansion of industries in Alberta, in this case the natural gas industry. This is not an unreasonable request to make. Therefore, I think the hon. members of this house should take some of these other factors into account when listening to the ridiculous and fallacious arguments advanced by at least two members from northern Ontario.

**Mr. Cowan:** Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make some comments with regard to the method of paying civil service salaries and wages on Thursday of last week, and to express regret that a subterfuge was used to make these payments.

I am very proud of the fact that I was elected to this parliament in 1962 when the Liberal party was in opposition, because I believe that from our position in opposition we were able to show the country that actions which were being taken by the government at that time were illegal, actions which we have mostly corrected since we came to power in April 1963.

The first matter which engaged the attention of the Liberal opposition in 1962, as we who were elected at that time and are still in the house very vividly recall, concerned the Customs Tariff Act and the Financial Administration Act which the then government of the day had invoked in order to raise and lower tariffs at the will of the executive without any reference to parliament itself.

I have been reading and rereading the discussion which took place in this house in October and November of 1962, and the amount of similarities which exist between the actions which we were criticizing in 1962 and the actions that were taken in this month of 1966 is unfortunate. I regret exceedingly that the high principles we enunciated in opposition in 1962 have been bent in 1966.

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, the way the cabinet announces that the government is going to do this, that or the other thing makes hon. members on this side wonder whether they are members of the government. Private members have to read about the actions taken by the cabinet in the press so as to find out what the government of the Liberal party is going to do. However, Mr. Chairman, as a private member and as a Liberal I call myself

[Mr. Olson.]

one member of the government, whether the cabinet admits it or not, and in so doing I regret that our high principles of 1962 are not being practised in 1966.

With regard to the matter of interim supply, the motion for interim supply could have been introduced somewhat earlier than it was. It was bandied about in the halls here for a week before it was introduced, and of course, Mr. Chairman, when you introduce it late you can then accuse the opposition of holding up supply because you state that there is a deadline which must be met.

In reading and rereading the arguments of 1962 to which I have referred, it is quite interesting to find the hon. Mr. Benidickson, now a member of the other place, criticizing the government of the day unmercifully for having taken action which was not approved by parliament. We were told times without number that the government had an opinion from the Deputy Attorney General which authorized the action.

I believe it has now been made public knowledge—so I am only repeating public knowledge when I say this—that we found when we came to power in April 1963 that no such opinion had been expressed by the Deputy Attorney General, but that now seems to be water over the dam or under the bridge.

Having pounded away on the basis that the government of the day—that is, 1962—should produce the opinion expressed by the then Deputy Attorney General, when we were challenged on this very score in 1966 we had to produce, of course, an opinion from the Department of Justice, reference having been made in this house to this fact. We have now all received a copy of the opinion given by the Department of Justice, Mr. Chairman, because it is now an appendix to *Hansard*. I have before me an exact copy of the opinion as tabled in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon.

I might point out that in 1962 Senator Benidickson referred to the fact that the government of the day had stated we must never question the authority of the Deputy Attorney General. Senator Benidickson and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre both questioned at that time the statement that you must not question an opinion given by the Deputy Attorney General. I know of no rule in the Canadian parliament, Mr. Chairman, that states you cannot question the opinion of anybody, including the Deputy Attorney General, if you so wish. At one time we used to question rulings of the Chair, but this right