

Provided further that the compensation to be paid shall be an amount to be agreed upon between the parties, or, in case of disagreement, shall be settled by arbitration under the provisions of the Arbitration Act of Manitoba or by a court of competent jurisdiction in that province.

I think that amendment should have been made to the bill: it would have been in the best interests of public ownership, private ownership and invested capital in this country.

I realize that legal arguments can be made on both sides. It may be said that Manitoba should have control over its natural resources because—and there is no disputing it—the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have had absolute control over their resources since Confederation. But there is a difference: if the old province of Quebec had granted a power site to a certain company, the Fathers of Confederation would have protected the rights of the company under the transfer. That is what I was seeking to accomplish by this amendment.

However, after the very able cross-examination conducted in committee by a distinguished senator from Toronto, the Premier of Manitoba should realize that in a Senate committee one cannot get away with murder, but has to watch his "P's" and "Q's"; I am persuaded that there will be no act of compulsion, and that the owners of these sites in Manitoba will receive fair compensation.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, the question is on the third reading of Bill K-11, an Act to amend the Manitoba Natural Resources Act. Is it your pleasure to concur in the third reading of this bill?

Some Hon. SENATORS: Carried.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: On division!

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time, and passed, on division.

PRIVATE BILL REFUND OF FEES

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Honourable senators, with the consent of the Senate, I should like to move that:

The parliamentary fees paid upon Bill E, an Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company and Canadian National Railway Company, be refunded to Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, less printing and translation costs.

The motion was agreed to.

CUSTOMS BILL SECOND READING

Hon. WISHART McL. ROBERTSON moved the second reading of Bill 229, an Act to amend the Customs Act.

He said: Honourable senators, the purpose of this bill is to make certain changes in the wording of the Act to bring it into conformity with changing administrative practices. This involves the repeal of certain obsolete sections and the revision of others. Most of the changes are of a comparatively simple and straightforward nature, such as the substitution of "Tariff Board" for "Board of Customs," in view of the fact that the last mentioned board is now defunct.

The Act has been revised with an eye to the undertakings Canada gave at Geneva, under Section VII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, concerning the basis of valuation for duty of imported goods. The wording of the Act has been changed to eliminate any conflict with these undertakings, but the changes so made are not of a substantial character. Whatever the final status of the General Agreement may be, the clauses are considered desirable from an administrative point of view. I am advised that while they are not of a material nature, they contribute in every respect to lessening the barriers on the importation of goods.

Honourable senators will recall that under the protocol of provisional application of the agreement, signatory nations were required by January 1, 1948, to put into effect, as far as was possible under their executive authority, the code of trade practices contained in part II of the General Agreement. Accordingly, the changes in customs valuation embodied in this bill have been in effect by order in council since the beginning of this year. It is now proposed to write them into the statutes. Other signatories of the protocol have taken reciprocal action, notably the Government of the United States, which has made certain changes in customs administration under its executive authority. Needless to say, they are limited to changes in administrative practice, and do not include those that would require consideration of Congress.

I may add that the bill as introduced in the other place contained a section arising directly out of our Geneva undertakings affecting the customs treatment of certain goods subject to British preference. This clause proved to be contentious, and the minister consented to remove it from the bill because it was not immediately necessary.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON moved the third reading of the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time, and passed.