

pating governments. Certainly a special responsibility will rest on the government and people of Quebec in the light of what happened following the 1964 agreement. No one hopes more sincerely than I that the June conference will be crowned with success. But I say the time has come for us as Canadians to be realistic and to think ahead to what the implications of failure may be. There is cause for concern, and Canadians will be foolish to shut their eyes to the hard facts with which we are faced in this country today.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Langlois, debate adjourned.

FORT-FALLS BRIDGE AUTHORITY BILL

SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, April 20, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Benidickson, for the second reading of Bill S-14, respecting the construction of an international highway bridge between Fort Frances, Ontario, and International Falls, Minnesota.

Hon. W. M. Benidickson: Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, since the honourable Senator Benidickson introduced and spoke on second reading of this bill, I must remind honourable senators that if he speaks now his speech will have the effect of closing the debate.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: Honourable senators, on April 7 we had a debate on second reading of this bill. At that time the honourable Senator Grosart addressed to me some pertinent questions, and it was understood that I would not move that this bill be sent to committee until I had answered those questions. He properly challenged me because I, perhaps rather flippantly, said that I did not know where the money to build the bridge was coming from. I said that, honourable senators, because of some experience connected with these international bridges.

The money seems to come from private lenders through the sale of debentures and bonds, and 95 per cent of the funds emanate from the United States. But we in Canada benefit from the traffic resulting from tourists travelling into Canada by way of these bridges. We also benefit from having these bridges connect with our highway system so that Canadians are facilitated when travelling to visit our neighbours to the south. So, honourable senators, I cannot answer that question of Senator Grosart's any more fully now than I could at that time, but seemingly even the State of Minnesota is prepared in the territory that I know, in a parliamentary way, to finance two bridges between Ontario and Minnesota.

The second question that Senator Grosart asked with respect to money is related to the clause of the bill which deals with possible liability by the Crown in connection

[Hon. Mr. Manning.]

with financing of this bridge. He drew our attention to clause 18 of the bill, which says:

18. The bonds or other obligations of the Authority are not obligations of Her Majesty, nor is Her Majesty liable on such obligations.

Furthermore they are not obligations of Her Majesty's servants or agents.

Senator Grosart further asked what we heard as to the views of the owners of the existing 65-year old bridge on the suggestion that there should be a new bridge somewhere in that vicinity. I said then, and I repeat it now, that this has been talked about for ten or 15 years, and to my knowledge the owners of the original bridge have registered no complaint. At least, they certainly have not registered any complaint with me.

There is no haste in the consideration of this bill. As I have said, it has been talked about for some time. Financial arrangements have to be worked out. A site has not yet been determined with any exactitude. Therefore, I think that the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications will have every opportunity of inviting the private owners of the existing bridge to make any representations they may choose. Furthermore, in the following weeks we can obtain the necessary information as to the financing arrangements required to facilitate the construction of this bridge.

I may say that I shall repeat during the committee stage my very strong objections to the policy of the Canadian Government incorporated in clause 26 of the bill. That clause reads:

26. The Authority shall provide and maintain at its expense such suitable office, warehouse and other accommodation, with adequate light and heat,

(a) as the Governor in Council or any Minister designated by the Governor in Council may from time to time require for Canadian customs and immigration purposes;

I say that we are accepting too much of the "big brother" principle when a facility of such advantage to Canada is provided by our friends to the south, in large part, and we have this continuing policy of saying that we will not even provide them with Canadian customs and immigration facilities.

I raised this question on December 17 when my honourable friend Senator Kinnear was dealing with an amending bill to another international bridge act, namely, the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company Act. It was the second last day of the sitting prior to the Christmas adjournment. The members of the Senate committee felt that there was something very wrong in adhering to this principle, and I propose to raise it again when we discuss this bill.

I have to the best of my ability tried to answer the very proper questions raised by the honourable Senator Grosart. If the bill receives second reading I will propose that it be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications. A former bridge bill was referred to the Senate Committee on National Finance,