

International Rivers

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member looks at citation 657, which is a résumé of the forms which an amendment may take, he will see that there is a footnote, May 390. If he looks at May 390, he will see that in addition to the three methods that are provided by citation 657, there are two or three other methods that have been deleted by Bourinot in his fourth edition and which do not appear in the 1943 edition of Beauchesne. This is because a practice has evolved, and previous Speakers' rulings make it so now, that what is understood by the reference of the subject matter of a bill to a committee must be to an existing committee or an existing commission.

Now, if the amendment were to read that the subject matter of the bill be referred to a standing committee or an existing commission, that would be in order.

Mr. Low: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact it appears that my amendment is out of order, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell):

That the word "now" be left out, and the words "this day six months" added at the end of the question.

Mr. Knowles: I rise to another point of order. It is a very technical one, I admit, but we might as well keep things straight and I am sure hon. members to my left can take care of it. I believe the hon. member for Macleod has already spoken and therefore cannot be the seconder of this amendment. The hon. member for Peace River will have to find someone else.

Mr. Low: I shall find someone else. I shall say the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch).

Mr. Speaker: This point is one which is technical, but sometimes we must take care of these little technicalities before they become serious offences. Therefore the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) moves, seconded by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), that this bill be not now read a second time but this day six months hence. Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Hahn: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; it was the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) who moved the amendment, not the hon. member for Macleod.

Mr. Speaker: If the house, by consent, is willing to cure the technical difficulty raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), then perhaps we could consider the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River, seconded by the hon. member for Acadia. Is the house ready for the question?

[Mr. Low.]

Mr. J. H. Blackmore (Lethbridge): Before the question is put I desire to make several comments which I feel are necessary. In the first place, may I draw to the attention of the people in the country, as well as the members in this house, how serious it is for this house to give a bill second reading. Once this bill is given second reading the House of Commons of Canada puts its seal of approval on the principle of the bill.

As the hon. member for Peace River has pointed out, it is not at all certain what the principle of the bill is. The bill is like a wolf in sheep's clothing. The sheep's clothing does not look too bad, but the wolf underneath does look bad. Now, the wolf that is underneath is the power to enter into the province of British Columbia and dictate policy in respect to the whole of the Columbia river. The general principle of the bill is to amend the Canadian constitution, the British North America Act, by an act of this parliament, and to base that act and its constitutionality upon the international joint commission and the boundary waters treaty of 1909.

I do not believe there is a member in this house or a responsible person in Canada who would be willing to base an amendment of the Canadian constitution on the boundary waters treaty of 1909 between the United States and Canada, in respect of international waters. Certainly I do not think there is a responsible person in this country over 18 years of age who would be willing to have the constitution of Canada amended by an act of this parliament, without any restraint whatever. This is the act of a power-hungry party that has been re-elected time and time again, sometimes by a minority of the votes in the country, but in such a way that it has so many members in the house it is impossible for the opposition to do a thing. The party in power has no opposition and can work its evil will, no matter how evil that will may happen to be.

Mr. Byrne: We may have the support of the Conservatives on this.

Mr. Blackmore: I will just leave that language as it is. I said "evil will", but I am not saying any member of the house is particularly evil. I am suggesting the people who are back behind the Liberal party are evil, and that they are aiming at the destruction of freedom on the North American continent. I do not hesitate a minute to suggest that. This bill is one of the very best evidences of that fact, for I do not think any individual or any department whatever that was not under sinister pressure from someone behind the scenes would try to pass a bill of that kind.