

Apart altogether from the irrelevance of the reference he made to my remarks, my honourable friend entirely ignored the qualifying words which I used, namely, "... pending the production by the provinces of a better method of amending the constitution." If those qualifying words mean anything, they mean pending a better method of amending the constitution than that defined in the British North America Act (1949) No. 2, which was the subject of the conference between the dominion and the provinces in 1950.

The answer I would give to my honourable friend is that two years have passed since the Prime Minister made his statement before the Dominion-Provincial conference, and during that time the provinces have made not a single gesture toward a better method of procedure for dealing with the six classes of subjects in the British North America Act which were tabulated for consideration. I submit most emphatically that at no time in my remarks during the debate on Senate reform—or "The Senate and its work", as it was called—did I suggest that the British North America Act (1949) No. 2 should be superseded or withdrawn. The Prime Minister made quite clear to the conference that he did not intend doing any such thing; and in support of that position I would point to the quotation made by my honourable friend from page 55 of the proceedings of the conference. That information will appear on *Hansard*, as my friend has been good enough to file the letter which he received recently from the Prime Minister, and to which he has referred.

The Prime Minister wanted to give the provinces ample time to work out an over-all procedure by which we could amend our own constitution, and for that reason he would not press independent federal action on certain classes of questions; but he never suggested at any time that he would weaken in his purpose to have the British North America Act amended in Canada rather than in the Imperial Parliament in Great Britain.

I heartily support the Prime Minister at that position, and I think it is rather unfortunate that the honourable senator from Ponteix (Hon. Mr. Marcotte) should have raised this whole question on redistribution in the way he did when the fires of an election campaign in a nearby province are burning rather intensely. Whether he did so unwittingly, I do not know, but I should have thought that he was above such things after having served so faithfully in this chamber for over twenty years. I am willing to think that what he did was accidental, but I am quite sure he will grant me the right to take exception or to deprecate the

possibility of having innocent and irrelevant statements of mine used as cannon-fodder by young antagonists who at this time are making political war with each other on the other side of the Ottawa River.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAYS

DOCUMENTS TABLED

Hon. A. K. Hugessen: Honourable senators, I desire to make a statement on the St. Lawrence Waterways project similar to one that was made by the Prime Minister in the other place this afternoon, and to table, for the information of the Senate, copies of the application of the Government of Canada to the International Joint Commission for an order of approval of the construction of certain works for development of power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, which the Prime Minister signed for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and forwarded to the commission yesterday.

I should also like to table copies of notes which, at a meeting that took place in Washington yesterday, were exchanged between the Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr. Chevrier), the Acting Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Bruce, and the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Hume Wrong. The United States Government has also sent to the International Joint Commission an application which was signed by the Acting Secretary of State in Mr. Chevrier's presence yesterday.

I am sure I am expressing the sentiments of the Senate when I say that we commend the Minister of Transport and the officials who have been dealing with this matter for the diligence they have shown in advancing this great project.

These applications request the International Joint Commission to approve the construction, by entities to be designated by the two federal governments, of works for the development of power in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. The works for which approval is requested are set out in Section 8 of the application, and are described in the agreement with the Province of Ontario dated December 3, 1951, which forms the schedule to the International Rapids Development Act passed at the last session of parliament.

As the question of the deep waterway is not being referred to the International Joint Commission in the applications which I have just mentioned, and as the governments of both Canada and the United States have for