

it refer to the 30,000 cubic second feet granted by this bill? I take it it does, because it is an amendment to this bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it the government's interpretation that this amendment refers to damage claims arising by reason of the previous diversion of 40,000 cubic second feet?

Mr. HOWE: I asked that question of our legal advisers, and I am advised that it refers entirely to claims arising out of the diversion of the 30,000 cubic second feet referred to in this bill—which opens up a very delightful avenue of speculation, it seems to me. However, after receiving the advice of our legal advisers I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Before this motion is adopted I want to point out two or three principles which have been overlooked by the house in connection with this application. This is purely a power bill; not by the widest stretch of the imagination can it be said to be a navigation work and a work for the general benefit of Canada, except in a very technical way. It is not in any sense a bill dealing with navigation. Between lake St. Francis and lake St. Louis the only navigation consists of small pleasure boats, some of the Canada Steamships boats, the *Rapids King*, the *Rapids Prince* and that sort of thing; but really the power bill does not touch the question of navigation as a whole.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we as a parliament have no power to part with these privileges. We should not give away the great water powers of this country in the haphazard manner in which we have granted this application. So far as I am concerned the government must take the responsibility for this bill, which has to do with the war effort only in small part. Principally it is a power bill, taking advantage of the present state of affairs to grab these water powers forever, in perpetuity, which are the property of the people of this country and which should not be parted with except under proper safeguards.

The purpose of this bill is known in every chartered bank in this country and every banking office in New York. When this application first came before parliament, away back in 1927, I introduced a bill to forestall order in council P.C. 422, which was referred to during the debate on this bill in this house and also in the senate. I proposed to transfer to parliament the right of the governor general in council under the Navigable Waters Protection Act, under which the Minister of Public Works had power to grant applications

to develop power out of that river by means of order in council. I proposed a bill to give this parliament power to deal with such matters, and now in the senate amendment to this bill I find that principle was part of the 1931 act, and will require parliament's sanction to a further 30,000 horse-power.

The Senate amendments are:

. . . Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company shall settle, pay and fully provide for the claims of riparians and other persons, including navigation companies, who may sustain any loss or damage by the exercise or in consequence of the exercise, in whole or in part, of the right by this act granted, including the execution of any remedial or control works incidental to such exercise of such right, erected by or for the said Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company.

I think before we adopt this amendment we should have a meeting with their honours concerning our war policy in regard to power and its control by a power controller. This whole problem goes back to 1922, at which time I also proposed that we should meet with their honours in regard to such a national policy. I believe we should have a joint committee of both houses to go into the question of a national hydro policy for this country in war time, by which the government of the day could generate and develop power on this international river as well as the interprovincial rivers of this country. I believe the government has power now, under the British North America Act and the War Measures Act, to adopt such a federal hydro policy, so that when navigable works are carried on, power may be developed, generated and distributed at cost to the two central industrial provinces, and monopoly may be avoided.

We should be very careful in parting with these water powers, which are the property of the people. Amendments similar to this were proposed a few years ago in connection with the Sifton bill, which sought all the water powers of the Georgian bay and Ottawa valley in Ontario, right up to the Nipigon, and new Ontario. At that time the department took the opposite stand with regard to the privileges and rights of the province of Ontario in the matter of navigation and water power. When this matter was up in 1922 and 1923, when Sir Adam Beck and the Ontario hydro wanted to develop power at the Morrisburg dam, this government took the opposite point of view and said it would effect the lowering of lake levels and the levels of the port of Montreal. According to the Canada Year Book we have a potential development of 42,000,000 horse-power in this country, of which only 7,000,000 horse-power,