

International Rivers

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Hanna | McIlraith |
| Hardie | McMillan |
| Harkness | Martin |
| Harris | Matheson |
| Harrison | Michaud |
| Hees | Mitchell (Sudbury) |
| Herridge | Montgomery |
| Hodgson | Murphy (Westmorland) |
| Howe (Port Arthur) | Nicholson |
| Howe (Wellington-Huron) | Nowlan |
| Huffman | Pearkes |
| Johnson (Kindersley) | Philpott |
| Jones | Pickersgill |
| Jutras | Pommer |
| Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough) | Pouliot |
| Kirk (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare) | Power (St. John's West) |
| Knight | Purdy |
| Knowles | Ratelle |
| Lafontaine | Reinke |
| Langlois (Gaspé) | Robichaud |
| Lapointe | Robinson (Bruce) |
| Leduc (Gatineau) | Robinson (Simcoe East) |
| Leduc (Jacques Cartier-Lasalle) | Rowe |
| Lefrançois | St. Laurent |
| Legare | Simmons |
| Lennard | Stick |
| Lesage | Stuart (Charlotte) |
| Lusby | Thatcher |
| MacDougall | Thibault |
| MacEachen | Tucker |
| MacInnis | Tustin |
| MacLean | Villeneuve |
| McCubbin | Weaver |
| McDonald | Weir |
| | Weselak |
| | Winch |
| | Winters |
| | Zapltny—118. |

disturbing aspect of this whole thing, especially when the letter went out over the signature of a responsible minister.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the government of British Columbia, a duly elected government responsible to the people of British Columbia, engaged in extensive consultation and utilized every means at its disposal to acquire all necessary information, following which it proposed to negotiate an agreement which, in the opinion of that government, was in the best interests of British Columbia. If that were true it would naturally, I believe, be in the best interests of Canada. It is impossible for me to conceive of anyone here or elsewhere assuming that the government of a province would not or could not or did not have in mind the welfare of the nation of which that province is a part. I feel that anyone who would suggest otherwise would not only be most unfair to the province, but would be doing a disservice to the people of Canada.

It has been pointed out in this house, again only a moment ago, that the Kaiser corporation would spend in British Columbia on the Castlegar dam the sum of \$30 million. Moreover, the corporation would pay to the province of British Columbia \$275,000 a year, and would make available each year an amount of electricity which based on a value of \$20 per kilowatt hour would be worth in the neighbourhood of an additional \$800,000 per year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a good deal from that specific point of view, why in the world does not some minister stand and say why not? At the same time he could follow up by offering a proposition which might be considered better.

Mr. Blackmore: Or as good.

Mr. Shaw: Well, yes, or as good. We are waiting for some minister to do just that. I repeat that whether you like the government of British Columbia or whether you do not, it is still reasonable to assume that the government is going to have in mind the best interests of the province of British Columbia and, I would declare it therefore follows, the best interests of Canada. Surely no responsible person is going to assume that a government, any provincial government in Canada, is going to sell out the interests of the province; yet that expression has been bandied about.

Mr. Blackmore: By irresponsible men.

Mr. Shaw: I would certainly call it an irresponsible position for men to take. Then, of course, you can follow it from there if you like, to determine the type of person who would likely do such a thing.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. Shall the main motion carry?

Mr. F. D. Shaw (Red Deer): It is conceivable that under normal circumstances a bill such as Bill No. 3 would not have engendered such protracted debate, nor would such strong differences of opinion have been expressed. However, it certainly cannot be said that the circumstances surrounding Bill No. 3 are in any sense normal. We have had a definite lack of information, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Peace River as well as by the hon. member for Lethbridge and others. We are still of the opinion, and thoroughly convinced, that before Bill No. 3 is given second reading the information which has been requested should be made available.

I refer at this moment only to the letter written by the Minister for Northern Affairs and National Resources, and referred to by the hon. member for Lethbridge. In sentence after sentence, paragraph after paragraph, we are faced with the indefinite, the opinion, the maybe, the suppose, but there was nothing substantial to back up either the observations or the opinions contained in that letter. In my opinion that is the most