

International Rivers

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

INTERNATIONAL RIVERS

PROVISION REQUIRING LICENCE FROM GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN ANY IMPROVEMENT

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Howe (Port Arthur) for the second reading of Bill No. 3, respecting the construction, operation and maintenance of international river improvements.

Mr. Low: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner hour I had laid down the general proposition that over the last 20 years I had personally witnessed a growing arrogance on the part of federal governments, particularly the one now in office, which had inspired them to assume powers which in many instances it was not thought they should ever have attempted to assume. I believe I closed on the note that we wondered at this time where this arrogance and hunger for unchecked power is going to end. That is a very serious consideration for every Canadian worthy of the name.

For example, what foolish things might this government or perhaps some other government be led to do in the years ahead if this Liberal government can get away with what they are trying to get away with in connection with this bill? Under these circumstances what provincial rights will ever be safe, especially those which are in the twilight zone that prevails in connection with unallocated powers under the constitution? That is the question.

I listened most carefully to what the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources had to say. I intend to quote briefly from his speech, beginning on page 1037 of *Hansard*, where the hon. gentleman made reference to clause 9 of the agreement between the Kaiser corporation and the province of British Columbia. After quoting part of clause 9 which refers to the licence issued pursuant to paragraph 8, he had this to say in reference to the Bonneville authority:

And, Mr. Speaker, the Bonneville authority, which is a United States federal agency, is not even a party to this agreement.

Mr. Herridge: That is the point.

Mr. Lesage: It is not even a party to this deal. Here the Kaiser company guarantees to the British Columbia government that the British Columbia government will get 20 per cent of the additional power generated by storage, but it will get it from the Bonneville authority, which is a federal agency, and that federal agency is not a party to the deal. And moreover there is no agreement referred to here between Bonneville and Kaiser.

regarded in some quarters as simply for the purpose of impinging upon provincial responsibility in this field.

I wish to repeat that I support fully the principle of equal remuneration for equal work, and all reasonable and practical measures for the extension of the application of the principle in this country. Since the recent establishment and organization of our women's bureau the department has done a good deal in this regard. It is the view of those who have engaged in this study that further investigation is desirable before final conclusions are reached as to the kind of legislative action in the federal field. I wish to assure my hon. friend that this investigation will be carried forward quickly to completion. And in doing so there will be opportunity for all private organizations and groups who have expressed general views in support of the legislative approach to confer with my department and produce relevant data in support of their views. That we will warmly welcome.

I hope that in view of what I have said, and after a discussion of this matter, the sponsor of this bill will not wish to press it to a vote but will feel that she has accomplished her purpose. If she finds that is not possible, it will be clear from what I have said that while I am not denying the good principle involved here, I shall have to vote against second reading of this particular bill.

(Translation):

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the house, I would like to ask you to call it six o'clock and I move the adjournment of the debate.

(Text):

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member would like to move the adjournment of the debate because he does not wish to commence his speech so close to six o'clock.

Mr. Knowles: Question.

Mr. Speaker: There is a motion for the adjournment of the debate. Either we call it six o'clock or the hon. member moves the adjournment.

Mr. Fleming: Or goes on speaking.

Mr. Speaker: Are the hon. members prepared to call it six o'clock at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On motion of Mr. Dupuis the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house took recess.