

*Northern Inland Waters Bill*

be paid, they must already be on the payroll of the government, and, consequently employees of the government.

I would draw your attention now, Mr. Speaker, to the proposed membership of the board. The government has been talking about extending the independence of these Councils and making the democratic process available to the Northwest Territories and to the Yukon by allowing for a larger number of elected members on the Councils. In these circumstances one might have thought provision would have been made in the bill for giving these bodies a say in these proceedings. Instead, what do we find? Clause seven says the boards to be established shall consist of not less than three and not more than seven members appointed by the Minister. Membership of each board is to include at least one nominee of each of the departments of the Government of Canada which, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, are most directly concerned with the management of water resources of the Territory and of the Territories, and at least one person nominated by the Commissioner of the Territory—who is an appointee of the federal government—after consultation with the Council.

As far as this government is concerned, we all know how limited is this conception of consultation. We have heard the minister's views with regard to consultation with the Eskimos in northern Ontario. We know what he interprets as being consultation. One nominee only is to be appointed by the Commissioner after consultation with the Territorial Council. This is a shocking insult. It is an affront to the democratic process. Here are two boards, their membership consisting of appointees of the minister, civil servants employed by this government, who will be free to dispose of the waters of these great Territories. Yet the Councils have only a very limited right of consultation as to the appointment of one member of the board. I think this is an insult to the people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

For how long will these licences to use water be given? There is one provision in the bill which allows for an extension of a licence for 25 years. Mr. Speaker, before 25 years have gone by one or both of these Territories will perhaps have expanded its population and economy to the point of acquiring provincial status. Yet they will be faced with the consequences of decisions made by a minister sitting in Ottawa with the assistance of boards he himself appointed. It might well be

that the minister, or his departmental officials, have failed to take this aspect into account. I hope that before the bill comes back to the House the hon. gentleman will take a hard look at this proposal and do something to purge this insult to the people of the Northwest Territories and of the Yukon Territory.

I turn, now, to the major point I wish to make and in respect of which I intend to move an amendment in due course. Let us not kid ourselves. We are facing on this continent at the present time a situation in which the authorities in Washington have been talking about the continental sharing of energy resources. I know the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) made a comment the other day in which he hastily disclaimed any intent on his part to include water in this package. The Prime Minister, however, has made statements in the past which indicate beyond any doubt that he feels a certain freedom on his part, when certain conditions are satisfied, to dispose of the water resources of Canada. Despite what he said today, the Prime Minister exercises great freedom in expressing his views outside this House, making statements and comments at universities and elsewhere which later we find becoming the principles which animate this government. For these reasons I believe the House would be derelict in its duty if we allowed the bill to pass in its present form, especially bearing in mind what we know to be the thinking of our friends to the south and what we know to be the thinking of the Prime Minister as conveyed in statements he made not so long ago when he was appearing before a group of university students in an interview which was televised.

Allow me to develop the basis upon which I make this statement. In clause two of this bill, the definitions clause, we find in subclause (2):

For the purposes of this Act, diversion of waters from a water course, whether the water course is seasonal or otherwise, and obstruction of any such water course shall be deemed to constitute uses of waters.

In other words, the diversion of waters is equated with the use of waters.

● (3:40 p.m.)

Clause 3 provides that no person shall alter or divert the flow of water except pursuant to a licence held by him. I do not want to deal with these clauses seriatim in discussing the bill; I simply want to build up my case in