

*Appropriation Act No. 8*

He was referring to the Diefenbaker government. Gentlemen, I maintain that parliament still has the right to approve of expenditures before they are made. I resent being asked to vote full supply for the Post Office Department—say, for the purchase of mail bags—and later on find that it is being used to pay the salaries of people in other departments of government. I am voting for interim supply. I would have voted for it last week, but I cannot sit by idly and have it said that I was willing to see the rights of parliament trampled upon. In 1962 Mr. Benidickson referred to this as a fundamental right of parliament. The hon. member for Leeds in 1962 referred to it as a vital constitutional question. It is still in 1966, and I resent the manner in which the salaries were paid prior to the holiday. I am voting for interim supply; I will vote for it in the committee stage, and on third reading, but I do not want it said that I sat idly by when the rights of parliament were being trampled on and money voted for one purpose was being converted to another.

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any further part in this debate. However, I was forced to my feet by the spirited defence of the government by the hon. member for Medicine Hat. This is not a new occurrence. Often we have seen the hon. member rise in defence of the government. In fact I do not know why he does not go over and take a cabinet post. He might be a big improvement on some of the others. His arguments do not make any more sense, but he makes them much more forcefully. He referred to the fact that we have—and this has been the government's line throughout the whole story—this urgent need for gas in southern Ontario. The reason this application was made was the short route across the United States which would allow the demand to be met before the gas was frittered away to United States interests. It also is said that the southern route will be of great assistance to the north, but the fact is completely ignored that this is a doubtful statement. The minute you start the northern loop, you will immediately release more gas to the south. In fact, the minute there is a loop from Emerson to the lakehead some of the gas presently being used can go straight through the pipe for the southern needs. But when you make the next loop from the lakehead to the Porcupine area, all the gas that is being used there can be shot off through the southern markets. Therefore, the improvement would be immediate if the northern line were looped.

23033—631½

Just how the southern line will assist the north is rather vague, because if the demand is as great as is stated—great enough that they request the immediate building of a line through the south—then this means that the demand in the south is going to use up all the gas that can be shoved through that line. By virtue of the agreement which Trans-Canada Pipe Lines signed they must at all times supply over 50 per cent of the Canadian needs through the northern line. So, I can see that this would eliminate completely any extra gas being shoved through the northern line. They are in a rush to supply this gas to southern Ontario, but they do not suggest the method which they could follow right now. We cannot start building this line until we have the permission of the United States, and there is a good chance the United States Federal Power Commission will not grant that permission. So, why are we frittering away all this time when we have an urgent need? There is nothing to prevent a start being made in Canada now, and there has been nothing in the last ten years which prevented us from building another line across Canada.

The hon. member for Bow River and others have attempted to make out that we are opposed to the export of gas. Nothing could be more silly. If you want to export gas to the United States, then we say build a line from Vancouver, one from Calgary, one from Regina, one from Emerson, one from the lakehead, one from Sault Ste. Marie and one from Sarnia. These centres are all well within 100 miles of the United States border and some are right on the border. Why use the subterfuge of supplying Canadian customers to build a line into the United States? What is the reason for this? We are not opposed to the exportation of gas in any shape or form. What we are opposed to is the shipment of gas to Canadian consumers through a foreign country and placing those Canadian customers in a position where they are subject to the whims, rules and regulations laid down by a foreign country. It is this to which we object. The hon. member for Timiskaming and myself are completely incensed by the idea that this government is going to deliberately set out to hamstring industrial development in this country for the next four or five years as a minimum. The only hope we have right now is that the Federal Power Commission in the United States still may save us from our own folly.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to take part in this discussion until I