

International Rivers

bureaucratic control. It is obvious that the socialists are justified in supporting the bill because, after all, it does cut down on the rights of the provinces.

Let me draw the attention of hon. members in the C.C.F. party to this point. While some of them may be supporting the bill because of socialist principles, it seems to me that the wool has been pulled over their eyes because there is a very strong possibility that the bill was introduced to protect vested interests in the province of British Columbia. In the same letter to the Trail chamber of commerce, dated January 4, 1955, one of the arguments advanced by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources is:

The terms of the agreement proposed by the B.C. government will have an unfavourable effect on the Canadian aluminum industry, particularly in British Columbia.

While it is certainly my wish that every industry in British Columbia prosper, are we to take it that the interests of one particular industry are more important than and overshadow the interests of the people of British Columbia? As Social Crediters, we will fight this bill in order to prevent the curtailment of a province's rights, because our concepts and political beliefs with respect to life and government call for greater and greater decentralization of power which is the only way to preserve the rights of the provinces and the worth and dignity of every individual in these respective communities.

Until better arguments are advanced by the government side, I am sorry to say that it is my view that the bill is intended for only one purpose, to bully the province of British Columbia into submission to federal dictates in a matter primarily local in character. While we Social Crediters are men of peace and harmony, we will fight because we certainly dislike bullies, especially if they are political ones.

I trust that the hearings and submissions before the external affairs committee, to which the bill is being referred, will indicate that the bill is not another classic example of the Liberals, assisted by their socialist C.C.F. midwife, giving birth to illegitimate and prejudicial legislation. I know of no other time when fuller and freer discussion was more necessary on an important matter.

The most effective contribution which hon. members can make to the cause of maintaining provincial rights and harmony in our nation depends upon a clear exposition of the nature of the dispute which prompted this measure and the high-handed methods of the government in dealing with one of the great provinces of this country. We of course are opposed to the bill first of all

because it is contrary to the best interests of the people of British Columbia. We are opposed to it because the bill is against the proper economic development of that province and against the best interests of a united Canada. The only interests which the bill seems to favour are the best interests of a few politicians and the Liberal party which seems to be more interested in perpetuating itself in office than in having concern for the little people of the country.

Mr. T. H. Goode (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter this debate at all because I am of the opinion that unless you know something about constitutional law or are an engineer you should wait until you hear the facts in the external affairs committee.

Mr. Blackmore: Too late then.

Mr. Goode: May I give my young friend, the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Holowach), a little friendly advice. He has only been here for a very short time, but he will find that the external affairs committee consists of rather important members of the house who take their work most seriously. I think he will also find that his leader will make sure that the evidence brought out before that committee is to the point and not irrelevant.

My hon. friend brought me into this debate because he founded his speech upon a talk made over radio station CBU, Vancouver, on November 29 by the Hon. Mr. Sommers. I understand that he was making use of free political time on the air. The speech was considered both by listeners and by the Social Credit party as being a political speech. It was a good speech. I gave the Hon. Mr. Sommers full marks for it. It presented the provincial government's view on this matter but it presented it as a Social Credit political idea. No one will argue about that, certainly not my hon. friends opposite. The speech went on to attack the federal government with respect to a supposed veto. Undoubtedly a minister of the provincial government of British Columbia has that right when making use of that type of radio time, but it was a political speech.

Two days later the speech, printed by the queen's printer in Victoria on the order of the minister who had made the speech, was issued to every elementary school in my riding. It was sent under the stamp of the queen's printer and mailed to these schools for the extension of that information to the pupils there. I resent most highly, Mr. Speaker, as I am quite sure my hon. friends of the Social Credit party sitting in this house